

is apparently becoming par for the course in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7035, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for the balance of the week is the pending bill, and after the disposition of this bill there is H.R. 3279, increasing travel allowance for Federal employees.

Mr. HALLECK. And that will conclude the work for this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all I have now.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of nothing else at the present time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to bring to you today another unanimous report, from our Committee on Appropriations, for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. This is the 15th year that I have had the opportunity of working on this bill and the 11th year as chairman. For 11 years now we have had a unanimous report coming out of our committee. I started on this subcommittee back in the days that many of you will remember, with Frank Keefe of Wisconsin, who did such a splendid job in the fields of labor, health, and education in 1947 and 1948. We have tried to continue this progress.

First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of our committee; on this side, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], for the long hours they put in on the hearings, meeting all day and many nights until 6 o'clock in the evening. I want to thank them for the help that they have given me, and also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the ranking Republican member, who has been of such great help, and who knows as much about this bill as I do. The new member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has done a remarkable job and has given us much assistance during this, his first year. Of course, I could not

stop there without saying a word for our clerk, Mr. Moyer. We think we have the best clerk of any Committee on Appropriations in the House.

This is a unanimous report from the committee. That means compromise. There are some areas in which I think we ought to be doing more and there are members of the committee who think that we ought to be doing less. This bill is the result of 7 or 8 weeks of hearings and compromise on both sides. So we come to you with a unanimous report.

There are three or four items in the bill this year that I think are unusually important. One has to do with training programs.

For the last several years the Committee has encouraged, especially the Department of Labor, to institute a really effective program for the training of men and women for skilled industrial jobs. This is especially important in areas where automation, migration of industry, and other economic factors have raised unemployment to high levels.

While such a program is needed to relieve unemployment, the relief of unemployment is far from being the only factor involved. We have the situation today where large numbers are unemployed and at the same time there is a large unfilled demand for people skilled in certain industrial activities. Anyone who doubts that situation exists has only to look at the many columns of help-wanted ads in the Sunday edition of any metropolitan newspaper. Thus we have a, perhaps equally important, problem of meeting an existing demand for much needed, skilled people.

This year the committee has decided to quit just talking about this problem and has included funds in the bill to start really doing something about it. Funds are included in the Secretary of Labor's Office to supervise and coordinate the program in the Department of Labor. Funds are included in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make a study of the problems resulting from automation. The committee has approved the small increase requested for the promotion of industrial training programs in the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and, in addition, has recommended an increase of \$500,000 over the budget to enable this Bureau to staff up to the level necessary to do a really effective job. The committee has increased by \$1 million the appropriation request for area vocational educational programs under the Defense Education Act and will expect that these programs be encouraged to follow the lines that will result in maximum contribution toward the solution of this problem. Finally the committee has recommended an increase, over the budget request, for the cooperative research program in the Office of Education, and will expect that a part of this increase be used to establish at least one demonstration project in the field of training, and of retraining persons displaced from their jobs in industry.

In the hearings with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, considerable time was spent on the ques-

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the unanimous consent request, is the gentleman saying that there is so little interest in the House of Representatives in the spending of nearly \$4.5 billion of the taxpayers' money that general debate can be disposed of in 2 hours?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, we did it last year without any trouble, and we thought all questions were answered last year and 2 years ago. I am sure the gentleman knows that about half of the total of the bill is grants to States for public assistance, and there is nothing that you or I can do about it in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to observe that this abbreviated procedure

tion of hospital costs. We were told that hospital costs have gone up 300 percent in the last 20 years; and all through the hearings, if you have time to read them, you will find that we have been insisting that more attention be spent on training physical therapists and others that can help in expanding the home-care programs and permit people to get out of the hospital sooner than they otherwise would be able. We have also added a special appropriation for a new program of research in hospital facilities. There is \$10 million in the bill for this new program.

We had evidence given to us by doctors from the Mayo Clinic and the Methodist Hospital in Rochester who have been working on a project now for 6 years, studying the value of a new design for hospitals. In the last 40 or 50 years there has been little change in the design of hospitals. As a result of their study, they came to our committee and told us, after this 6-year study of the problem, that they were able to bring down the cost of nursing care in the intensive ward area from \$54 a day to \$14 a day. This is one of the most significant findings that was presented to our committee this year. That is why we included the \$10 million as a new item.

I shall try to go down the table in the report; and if Members have the committee report in front of them, they will be able to follow the explanation of the changes made by the committee from the suggestions of the Budget.

In the Department of Labor we cut the appropriation for the Secretary by \$184,000; \$150,000 of the cut was to cover the cost of the Labor-Management Committee set up by the President. We thought this should be financed all in one place, rather than split between the Departments of Commerce and Labor. We cut out \$27,000 for two positions in Civil Defense and another \$7,000 item for a new position in the personnel office.

In the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports we made a reduction of \$500,000 from the request because the workload did not come up to what they expected.

In the Bureau of International Labor Affairs they asked for an increase of some \$130,000, and we gave them half the increase asked for.

In the Office of the Solicitor we approved the budget estimate.

For the Bureau of Labor Standards we approved the budget estimate.

In the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment Rights we gave them the amount they asked for.

For the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, because of automation and other factors we have included \$647,000 more than they have this year. The recommended increase includes approval of the requested increase of \$147,000 aimed primarily at strengthening the Bureau's support of the Department's manpower program by providing staff and promotional materials to expand and improve training in industry. The Committee has added another \$500,000 to initiate a really effective program of training. The Committee will expect

that special emphasis be given to those areas of high unemployment due to increased automation, migration of industry, and other factors; and to those areas where serious shortages of properly trained personnel exist.

In the Bureau of Employment Security we made a small cut of \$158,000 from the amount requested for salaries and expenses.

We cut the Employees' Compensation Fund \$1,500,000, because they gave us a new estimate that indicated this amount will not be needed.

We gave the Bureau of Labor Statistics just what was asked for. We also gave the Women's Bureau the budget estimate, \$668,000, and we gave the Wage and Hour Division what was asked for.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Now as to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we gave the Food and Drug Administration what they asked for. I think we should have given them more, but it was a compromise and I am supporting this amount.

Mr. Chairman, few agencies of the Federal Government fulfill a more responsible and necessary role than the Food and Drug Administration. And few areas subject to Federal action are experiencing more dynamic changes than those over which the Food and Drug Administration has responsibility. In a very literal sense, this agency has the direct and personal welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States under its protection. Every American relies upon the Food and Drug Administration each day for a supply of safe and pure foods, drugs, and cosmetics. And in times such as these when technology provides us with a myriad of new food preparations, complex drugs undreamed of even 5 or 10 years ago, and almost unimaginable varieties of cosmetic products, these responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration become all the more vital to the everyday health and well-being of the American people. It might be worth while to pause very briefly and mention a few FDA responsibilities which have become more difficult to fulfill as a result of changing times.

PESTICIDES

One such responsibility is to protect all consumers of foods—especially consumers of fresh produce—from excessive residues of toxic pesticides and other agricultural chemicals which might still be on these foods after they enter the interstate market. It is interesting to note that, whereas prior to 1940 there were fewer than half a dozen chemicals available as pesticides, there are today over 200 such chemicals used in over 45,000 chemical preparations. These in turn are used to the tune of 600 million pounds by 2 million farmers on every crop grown in this country. Some of these pesticides, I might add, are so toxic that a drop undiluted falling on the skin of a human being can cause death. The way these chemical agents are used, therefore, becomes extremely important. Unless they are applied to crops in accordance with prescribed directions for use, residues of

these poisonous chemicals can remain on the crops and find their way to the consumer's dinner table.

Since it is impossible to survey how every farmer uses each of these pesticides during the crop cycle, it becomes imperative that, at the very least, we sample these crops once they are in interstate commerce to make sure that they do not contain residues which would be harmful to consumers. This sampling job, Mr. Chairman, is a responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration.

It is of great concern to me—and I am sure to all American consumers—that with the resources now available, FDA can sample only one-fifth of 1 percent of the estimated 2,500,000 interstate shipments of food crops which have been treated with these agricultural chemicals. In terms of numbers, this amounts to the collection of approximately 5,000 samples a year, out of the estimated 2,500,000 shipments. During the hearings before my subcommittee, testimony was provided to show that in order to determine the extent of the problem, let alone to provide minimum protection, FDA should sample at least 1 percent or 25,000 samples of the annual shipments of food crops treated with agricultural chemicals. This certainly seems reasonable. The appropriations which we would provide the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 1962 would permit that agency, by 1963, to collect 13,000 samples, equivalent to a sampling of one-half of 1 percent of the annual interstate shipments of such food crops. This is progress in the right direction.

DRUGS

Another responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration which has been given an entirely new look as a result of technological changes, as well as a result of new techniques of distribution and marketing, is the responsibility to protect all Americans from unsafe, impotent, and mislabeled drugs. It is interesting to note that in fiscal year 1960 the Food and Drug Administration received 480 new drug applications. In effect, therefore, we can say that a new drug is developed in this Nation on the average of more than one every day. In addition to this, the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 1960 received 2,059 so-called supplements of new drugs. These supplements are changes in new drugs which had been previously approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

Not only are new drugs being developed and changed in greater numbers, but they are for the most part more complex than before. Some have timing agents which permit them to dissolve and to react over a period of time. Some are so potent that they must be administered only by specialists with extreme caution. Some are very prone to habit forming. Others can develop serious reactions with certain individuals. Yet it is the responsibility of FDA to clear for safety each of these drugs and their supplements before they can be marketed. Then FDA must make sure that they are

being marketed under the approved labeling, that they contain the approved ingredients, and that they are sold under the approved means of distribution. This is a tremendous task.

It is also the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration to make certain that promotional literature for new drugs and their supplements submitted to physicians by the drug industry contain accurate and honest descriptions of the drugs, how they are to be used, and what they can affect. When one considers that the general practitioner in this Nation receives an average of 4,700 such pieces of literature annually and that the Food and Drug Administration seriously reviews only 2 percent—100—of these, we can begin to visualize clearly the scope of the FDA responsibility.

Likewise, when we realize that there are over 56,000 retail drugstores which must be inspected to guard against illegal sale of prescription drugs and of counterfeit drugs—a problem of growing dimensions—we can again better understand what the Food and Drug Administration faces. When we realize that there are over 12,000 manufacturers of drugs which have to be surveyed to ascertain whether or not FDA-approved drugs are being manufactured in accordance with proper safety controls, we get an even better picture of the responsibilities which are the Food and Drug Administration's in this area.

Recent findings of the Kefauver committee, as well as a recent study of FDA drug operations made by a special committee headed by Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, President of the National Academy of Sciences, have indicated, in the former case, the phenomenal changes which have occurred in the development, manufacture and distribution of drugs, and, in the latter case, the inadequate resources available to the Food and Drug Administration to cope adequately with these changes and to provide the type of consumer protection which this Nation deserves. The appropriation for fiscal year 1962 would contribute substantially to the strengthening of FDA drug activities across the board.

OTHER PROBLEMS

These two problems are but two of a host of problems confronting the Food and Drug Administration as a result of relatively recent changes in the technology of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. As significant as these two problems are, others are no less significant. If time permitted, I would like to discuss a few of these at length. It suffice, however, merely to list some of them.

First. Food additives: There are over 3,000 chemicals used today in the manufacture, processing and packaging of foods. FDA must evaluate and prescribe tolerances for the safe use of each of these in every food product. It must then enforce such tolerances.

Second. Color additives: There are an estimated 465 manufacturers, packers and mixers of color additives and an estimated 18,000 firms using such additives. Each color additive must be tested for safety and used under specific tolerances established by the Food and Drug

Administration. FDA must also certify many of them on a batch-by-batch basis.

Third. Hazardous substances: Under an act passed by the Congress last year, FDA must evaluate household products which contain hazardous substances and must prescribe proper cautionary labeling for each such product. There are an estimated 300,000 trade items used in and around the household containing dangerous substances.

Fourth. Frozen foods: This means of processing and distributing foods has grown phenomenally. Prior to World War II frozen foods output in this country was about 268 million pounds a year. Today the output is well over 5 billion pounds annually. Since these products do not receive a final heating during manufacture, and since they are consumed in the home often without sufficient heat to destroy micro-organisms, it becomes imperative that they be produced in the plant under the most sanitary conditions and that they are not subject to any mishandling in commerce. FDA inspections must assure that this is the case.

Fourth. Cosmetics: This is an industry which has made great strides in the past decade or so. Retail sales of cosmetics approach an annual figure of \$2 billion. There are approximately 2,000 manufacturers and distributors in the United States. The big problem here, is that cosmetics now on the market and being developed be subjected to adequate tests to determine their safety for individual users. Each year the Food and Drug Administration encounters products which have not received that type of testing and which are causing harm to users. The job of sampling the thousands of cosmetic products on the market and those which are constantly being added is a task of huge dimensions for the Food and Drug Administration.

Thus, citing only a handful of problems, we get some concept of the importance of the Food and Drug Administration's activities to the health and welfare of each and every American and of the complexity of these problems in changing times such as these.

The fiscal year 1962 appropriations would be another in a series of steps taken by the Congress within recent years to bolster the Food and Drug Administration and provide it with the resources which experience and private studies, such as the Citizens Advisory Committee of 1955, have shown to be needed in order that this agency might fulfill adequate its responsibilities to the American people.

Over a period of years, my Subcommittee has heard testimony which overwhelmingly shows that FDA is not equipped with the manpower and other resources to do its job with the thoroughness necessary to provide maximum protection. FDA can inspect each of the estimated 100,000 establishments under its jurisdiction on the average of about once every 4 years. Problems such as those I have mentioned are not receiving the attention they must get. Only within the past 5 years has FDA been able to start replacing its obsolete scientific

equipment. Half of its inventory is still obsolete. Only since fiscal year 1958—over half a century since passage of the food and drug law—have funds been provided for renovation of the district office laboratories. Although the Congress has permitted FDA to make considerable strides in these recent years, the job is far from done. We must continue this progress until the American consumer has the protection to which he is entitled in these changing times. Should this fiscal year 1962 appropriation be provided FDA, it would represent an investment of about 13 cents for each American citizen. I can think of no investment bearing greater returns.

Next in order of consideration are the programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education. These programs are essential to our national progress and, indeed, to our very survival. The Congress has repeatedly affirmed its deep concern for education beginning with the first Morrill Act of 1862 to establish the great land-grant college institutions and more recently by the provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

One of the most successful of these programs is in vocational education. It helps to fill our needs for skilled manpower. It provides a weapon against unemployment. It cuts down school dropouts. It increases the efficiency of the Nation and provides wider occupational choices for the individual. Under this program, special training is provided for high school students and adults who need retraining or additional training for new jobs.

The sum of \$33,672,000 included in the bill for 1962 provides for continuation of the program at the 1961 level of operation and includes \$4 million to continue the practical nurse training program extended by the Congress earlier this year.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities participate in a permanent appropriation of \$2,550,000 a year and also share in an annual appropriation through the Bankhead-Jones Act—1935 and 1952. Last year the Congress increased the annual authorization from \$2,501,500 to \$11,950,000.

The bill provides \$8,194,000, which is an increase of \$5,692,500 over the 1961 appropriation and represents the first of two steps to reach the new maximum authorized by the Congress last year. Uniform grants to each State will increase from \$20,000 to \$90,000, and Puerto Rico will be included. Variable grants to each State based on population will increase from \$1,501,500 to \$3,604,000.

For many years the land-grant colleges have underwritten the Nation's progress in agriculture and the mechanic arts. About one-fifth of the total enrollment in higher education in the United States is accommodated by the land-grant colleges and universities.

GRANTS TO LIBRARY SERVICES

Last year the Library Services Act was extended through 1966—Public Law 86-

279—thus continuing a program that has brought new or improved public library services to over 35 million rural residents. Federal funds are limited to not more than 66 percent nor less than 33 percent of the total costs. The act opens the world to every isolated community. Over 250 new bookmobiles are on the roads as a result of this program. Over 1½ million rural children and adults who were formerly without any library services at all are participating. It liberates the home-bound and helps to provide education to thousands of rural communities.

The act continues to authorize \$7,500,000 a year to promote further development. This amount is requested for fiscal year 1962 to provide for the continuation of grants at the maximum authorized level.

No Federal program supplementing the education of our rural population has gained wider acceptance nor has been received with greater enthusiasm.

AID TO FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

The appropriation bill before the House today carries funds for the permanent provisions of the acts aiding schools in federally impacted areas. The sum of \$85,700,000 appears in the bill as "Payments to school districts" and another item of \$24,850,000 appears as "Assistance for school construction." The \$85 million item is the amount necessary to pay entitlements to federally impacted school districts authorized by Public Law 874 and the \$24 million item is the amount necessary for construction of school facilities as authorized by Public Law 815. I want to comment on the appropriation for these two programs because some members may have wondered at the amount for the 1962 fiscal year compared to the much larger amounts appropriated for these programs for the current fiscal year, totaling \$280 million for both programs.

In 1958 this Congress amended these two Federal impact laws by making permanent the provisions insofar as they apply to children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property. Congress extended the provisions authorizing payments to all other categories of Federal impact until June 30, 1961. Thus the appropriation of \$85 million for Public Law 874 and \$24 million for Public Law 815 includes only funds for payments for the children living on Federal bases. There is nothing in this appropriation for those districts educating children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property.

The administration has recommended permanent legislation to the current session of Congress for payments to school districts for children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property. At the same time, the proposed legislation provides that the rate of payment be cut in half from the present 50 percent of the local contribution rate to 25 percent of that rate.

I call this matter to your attention to explain why the appropriations we are voting on today for these two programs total only \$110,550,000, as compared with the \$280 million appropriated for the

current fiscal year. Also, I want to alert you to the fact that a supplemental appropriation will be required for these two programs whether Congress supports the administration's recommended cuts in payments or extends these two laws without the recommended reductions.

If Public Law 874 was extended in its present form, the estimated requirements for 1962 would be \$250 million. Under the extension recommended by the administration, the requirements would be \$158 million. If Public Law 815 was extended in its present form, the requirements would be about \$62 million. Under the amendments proposed by the administration, the estimated cost would be about \$45 million.

I am pleased to note that the Committee on Education and Labor has shown its good judgment in recommending against the proposed severe cuts and for continuation of the present program. I personally do not believe that this program should be curtailed in view of the continuing burdens placed upon communities by the tax-exempt status of Federal property.

In my home State of Rhode Island, 21 federally impacted school districts received approximately \$1,117,000 for 7,851 children whose parents were living in taxable homes in the 1960 fiscal year. Had the proposed amendments been in effect in 1960, these 21 federally impacted school districts would have received only \$558,000 for these same children. This is a very substantial cut for these districts to absorb at a time when the number of children brought into these communities by activities of the Federal Government is increasing each year.

DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The National Defense Education Act provides greatly needed assistance in States and their subdivisions, to communities, to school districts, and to individuals. Every State and practically every community, large or small, benefits from this act.

The bill includes \$210,857,000 which represents an increase of \$23,377,000 over the amount provided for fiscal year 1961.

STUDENT LOANS (TITLE II) (\$58,430,000 AMENDED TO \$75,145,000)

The student loan program allows needy students to borrow money for a college education. This year 145,000 students in 1,407 colleges will be aided in continuing their education. This program has met with universal acceptance and is one of the finest actions taken by this Government to encourage our people to invest in themselves through education.

SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (TITLE III) (\$57,750,000)

Title III of the NDEA is aimed at improving instruction in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages. It aids the schools in the acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling of laboratories and supports advances in foreign language instruction. Loans to nonprofit private schools are also available under terms of the act.

The schools have been deplorably weak in these important fields of instruction which are so definitely allied with the national defense. Under the impetus of NDEA there has been a fivefold increase in approved projects to strengthen instruction. Student enrollment has increased significantly. Teacher competency has been reinforced and State supervisory services are increasingly effective. I will insert in the Record at this point a statement of comments submitted by various local superintendents throughout the country showing the value of equipment acquired with the aid of NDEA funds.

Title III of the NDEA has brought about a dynamic change in thousands of schools. Instruction in science and mathematics has been upgraded and updated. Rural schools have been put on a par with their urban counterparts. New curriculum materials have been developed, new equipment has been purchased, laboratories have been modernized, new resource centers have been established and higher standards have been set. In thousands of schools, yesterday's obsolete scientific equipment has been replaced by the modern equipment used in industry and commerce; in hundreds of school laboratories, the age of electronics can now be taught and understood.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS (TITLE IV) (\$21,762,000)

The budget estimate for fiscal year 1962 represents an increase of \$1,012,000 over the amount provided in 1961.

The graduate fellowship program has expanded and strengthened graduate facilities in our colleges and universities. Over 680 graduate programs have been established or expanded in 149 graduate schools. Three-year fellowships have been awarded to 4,000 students for graduate study through 1961. The committee has reduced the budget request for this item by \$1 million which will curtail the program expansion in 1962 but will not reduce any existing programs.

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING (TITLE V): (A) GRANTS TO STATES (\$15 MILLION), (B) INSTITUTES FOR COUNSELING PERSONNEL (\$6,900,000)

In the kind of world we are facing, our youth must meet challenges which impose new requirements of personal initiative, effort, and ability. In order to accomplish this, we must maintain imaginative programs of guidance and counseling in our schools. This is the objective of title V of the NDEA. A dramatic example of how this program is aiding our schools reduce "drop-outs" and thereby to cut down on delinquency and unemployment is provided by the higher horizons project in New York City. This project has enabled the successful education transition of children coming from families of minority groups in New York City, such as Puerto Ricans, by providing special guidance and education programs which are supported by title V funds. Otherwise, a substantial number of these children would find it impossible to get alone in school with the result that many would drop out and add to the delinquency problem. This

is the sort of activity that needs to be spread across this country if we are to combat the evils of delinquency and the problems of unemployment due to lack of education.

ADVANCED TRAINING FOREIGN AREAS AND LANGUAGES (TITLE VI) (\$15,250,000)

The teaching of foreign languages so that the learner can converse fluently and comprehend quickly is an imperative skill in a world which, almost overnight, has shrunk to a neighborhood. Within the past few years the aims of such teaching have altered. The methods have changed. The materials of instruction have expanded. To meet this change, the NDEA is supporting more institutes for retraining teachers and more research to discover the most effective teaching methods and develop specialized materials.

Under the NDEA, 48 language centers are now in operation and more than 4,000 teachers will attend summer institutes in 1962.

Great progress is being made in the development of teaching materials such as guides, grammars, readers, and manuals; and projects have been undertaken for research in the improvement of the technique of teaching languages.

NEW EDUCATIONAL MEDIA: RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION (TITLE VII) (\$4,700,000)

Educators and laymen alike are convinced that the solution of many of our educational problems may be found in the wider and more effective use of motion pictures, TV, radio, and the other media of communication. Current developments in teaching machines, educational TV, language laboratories, and similar devices are opening up possibilities that hold much promise for improvement of educational communication. This program will undoubtedly introduce changes in practice, but more importantly, it is creating a solid basis for changes built on sound research.

AREA VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS (TITLE VIII) (\$12,800,000)

This allocation provides for the training of technicians in occupations requiring scientific know-how in fields necessary for the national defense such as automation, chemical and metallurgical engineering, civil construction, and electronics.

Prior to the advent of the NDEA a relatively small number of schools and institutions in a comparatively small number of States offered technical programs for training technicians. Now new buildings and facilities are being provided by the States and communities. High standards have been developed and students of top-level ability are being attracted.

The committee believes the acceleration of this program can be accomplished by adding \$1 million to the budget request as provided by the Committee bill.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES (TITLE X) (\$1,550,000)

These grants provide a sorely needed stimulus toward implementation of adequate data systems and standard definitions essential in order to have meaningful and comparable data in the schools.

The work essential to achieving an adequate modern record and data system for the States and their 40,000 constituent local school units is underway.

Before the NDEA 13 States were using machine data processing to some extent, now 38 States either have installed or have definite plans to install machine systems.

This completes the presentation of the NDEA items.

MENTALLY RETARDED

The appropriation bill contains \$1 million for grants to aid in the training of teachers of mentally retarded children. The American promise of equality and human worth must extend to every child within the borders of our country, no matter what are his capacities or his lacks.

There is no community in the United States that does not contain youngsters handicapped by mental retardation. We know that mental retardation can be caused by a variety of conditions and diseases, and yet we are just beginning to realize that much can be done to prevent these causes and to cure the disease. The future holds a great deal of hope and promise for the mentally retarded. Thousands of them can be returned to health and well-being. Presently there are approximately a million and a quarter mentally retarded children in the Nation and only about one-fourth are receiving suitable education. Throughout the years, the greatest single barrier to the expansion of educational services for these children has been the lack of qualified teaching and supervisory personnel. The program developed under Public Law 85-926 will help greatly in alleviating this serious problem.

Public Law 85-926 is designed to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies. It is carrying on that objective in a constructive and heart warming way.

It is estimated that in 1962 the budget request of \$1 million would provide 68 fellowships to approximately 20 institutions of higher learning, plus 2 fellowships for each State; it is expected that this stimulation will reach the grass-roots in every community. We shall know more about mental retardation and be able to go forward with a program of rehabilitation and hope for the national welfare, the community progress and the individual well-being.

As our committee report indicates it is time for consideration of broadening this program to other areas of handicapped children, particularly those afflicted with speech and hearing defects. I plan to introduce legislation which I hope the legislative committee will urgently consider.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

There is no agency of Government which surpasses the U.S. Office of Education in the dedication and accomplishments of its small staff. The Office has grown in numbers in recent years because of the tremendous workload assumed under the NDEA and other actions of the Congress. But we must be

aware of the great importance of its contributions to the cause of education through the services it provides to all our citizens.

This is one of the areas where we had to compromise differences within the Committee. The bill provides for an increase over 1961 but is a reduction of \$500,000 from the request.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

The committee received expert testimony from a distinguished group of educators and private citizens who recommended a strengthening of the program of cooperative research in education conducted by the Office of Education. This research which is done in the colleges and school systems throughout the country has shown remarkable potentiality for improving educational practices. In recognition of the administration's concern for this program, the President sent a special message and amendment to the budget of the Office of Education which asked for increased research funds for the areas of English instruction and the identification of talent.

It is a national disgrace that the total investment in education research in this country is such a small fraction of the tens of billions of dollars spent by our people on education. We felt that the testimony received by the committee from this eminent group of educators gave the committee sufficient evidence to support an increase in the budget for this activity. Accordingly, the bill contains \$5.5 million for this purpose, an increase of \$360,000 over the revised amount recommended by the President. Further, in view of the increasing importance of this activity the committee recommends in the bill its establishment as a separate appropriation account rather than its continued inclusion in the salaries and expenses budget of the Office of Education. In this way the Congress can have a much clearer concept of the amount of money available for this purpose.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The bill recommends approval of all funds requested for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, plus certain increases. This Federal-State program, which is devoted to rehabilitating disabled people and placing them in useful jobs, is doing one of the better jobs among public agencies today. It has had the interest and support of both political parties, both in the Congress and in the executive branch, and our confidence in it has not been misplaced. The number of disabled people being rehabilitated is increasing steadily each year, although I must say that I would be much happier if the rate of increase could be stepped up.

The request for grants to States for support of the basic program of rehabilitation services was for \$90 million. The request made no provision for an allotment base, which has been used in this appropriation for several years to make available maximum Federal funds for State matching, without appropriating large sums which we know will revert to the Treasury. The committee has,

therefore, reinstated in this bill the provision for an allotment base, in the amount of \$90 million, thereby making it unnecessary to appropriate some \$27 million which would not have been used.

The committee has recommended increases for the research and training programs of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. In my opinion, the funds for this important work are still far short of what we should be investing, and I am disappointed that the administration's request was so far short of the need.

The request for training funds is a good example of what I mean. We cannot expect to see major increases in rehabilitation services for disabled people unless we do something about the serious shortages of professional personnel who work with the disabled. Despite repeated testimony before the committee, from experts within the Government and outside, describing the serious and widespread effects of these shortages, we still are getting requests for inadequate funds to reduce these shortages and to permit public and voluntary agencies in rehabilitation to recruit trained personnel when they need them. The committee, accordingly, has increased the amount for training by \$1 million.

In the rehabilitation research program, I have been equally disappointed that the request for 1962 made so little provision for the expansion needed. We must be willing to invest much more in the pursuit of new knowledge of our rehabilitation programs of the future are to measure up to their responsibilities. The committee has noted a number of research projects now underway which give promise of helping to do a better job among the severely disabled, particularly among disabled persons who are social security beneficiaries, as well as others in their later years. In mental retardation, I have noted with satisfaction that a number of research projects are underway, as well as demonstration projects to apply earlier research findings.

These and other evidences of progress are encouraging, but this research program is still operating on an extremely limited scale and I hope that the request for next year will indicate a more realistic approach to research needs in this important field.

As one step in this direction, the committee has included in this bill an additional \$1 million for the establishment of two or three pilot regional rehabilitation institutes, in which a comprehensive effort can be made in programs of teaching and research in rehabilitation. The committee received testimony which convinces us that such institutes can play an extremely important role in advancing this whole field, and particularly in undergraduate and graduate teaching in physical medicine and rehabilitation, along with the other specialized fields in rehabilitation. Each of these centers would also have formal working arrangements with a large voluntary rehabilitation center which provides services to disabled people, so that the teaching and research phases could

be related to the practical needs of service programs.

The committee is in complete agreement on the amounts in this bill for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and I urge your support of this appropriation.

For the Public Health Service, with respect to buildings and facilities, we gave them what they asked for.

Under community health activities, many appropriation items were lumped together. We broke them down into individual items, like chronic diseases and health of the aged, communicable disease activities, control of venereal diseases, control of tuberculosis, community health practice and research, and so forth. Starting on page 14 you can see the comparison between the amounts for last year and the amounts in the bill.

AIR POLLUTION

In one area, air pollution, we have allowed \$500,000 more than the budget requested because of the terrific problem we are having now in that field.

No other environmental hazard, it seems to me, is growing faster in importance than air pollution. This is true whether you judge it by the growing public awareness of the problem—as reflected in the newspapers and magazines—or by the growing evidence that filth in the air, like filth in the water, can seriously endanger our health.

The projected budget increase for the Public Health Service's part in the national effort to keep air pollution within bounds can be justified, in my opinion, by a single fact: all four of the principal sources of air pollution are expected to grow even faster in the near future than they have in the past. These are population, urbanization, industrialization, transportation.

That means more people, crowding more than ever into our biggest metropolitan areas. It means more industries—to supply our wants and to keep our living standards climbing, but also to dump more and more waste products into the urban atmosphere. It means more and more cars and trucks belching their exhaust gases on our streets and highways.

But there are also other new facts which give urgency to our need for more vigorous Federal leadership in this field.

For example, the early evidence—primarily statistical evidence—which indicated an association between air pollution and lung cancer is being increasingly confirmed by followup studies, in the laboratory as well as in the field. One of the latest and most meaningful of these is the production, for the first time, of a human type of lung cancer in mice by inhalation of air pollutants.

In addition to new knowledge about cancer, with which we are all so deeply concerned, the Public Health Service program is also providing convincing evidence of the relationship between air pollution and other types of lung ailments.

Research in these important areas must be accelerated. Furthermore, we must make more effort to apply—much more generally than is now being done—

what we already know about controlling air pollution.

While air pollution's economic damage is less alarming than its potential health hazards, it certainly seems worth mentioning when you consider that the latest estimates put the national annual economic toll as high as \$7.5 billion. This includes injury to vegetation and livestock, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, interference with visibility, and depression of property values.

The efforts of the Public Health Service, of course, are calculated to help reduce both kinds of damage. The increase in the budget for Federal activity in this field is in line with the objective suggested in President Kennedy's message on natural resources, to provide "new leadership, research, and financial aid and technical assistance for the control of air pollution."

In this connection, I also want to make a few comments on two of America's biggest industries, the automobile industry and the oil industry, and their contributions—to air pollution and to air pollution control.

Motor vehicles constitute one of the major sources of air pollution and, unlike many other important pollutant sources, this one is universal throughout the United States. Our cars and trucks go everywhere.

I cannot escape the conclusion that the automobile industry has been dragging its feet in the matter of factory installation of blow-by devices. These, as you probably know, are relatively inexpensive devices for controlling emissions from automotive crankcases. While they will not solve the larger problem of exhaust emissions from the tailpipe, they do eliminate from one-fourth to one-third of the motorcar's total contribution to our air pollution problem.

Such devices were factory-installed on new cars sold this year in the one State of California and are available—at a higher price, of course—as optional dealer-installed equipment on new American cars in other localities. In view of the mounting evidence that air pollution not only is costly but may also be highly hazardous to human health—and since this new device eliminates a part of it at a low cost—it would have seemed both good business and good public relations for the auto industry to install such a device at the factory on all new cars sold in this country. This, in fact, is what Secretary Ribicoff recently recommended.

Unlike automobiles, oil refineries are not an important part of the air pollution problem in every city, but they certainly are in many cities. In the Los Angeles area refineries have placed into effect control measures which drastically reduce their potential contribution to Los Angeles smog. What this means, then, is that Los Angeles suffers a minimum of refinery emissions and, in addition, receives new cars with blow-by control devices factory installed.

In other parts of the country, however, neither the automobile industry nor the

oil industry is cooperating half so well. New Jersey, for example, is one of the many States that receive almost none of the advantages insisted upon in Los Angeles. New Jersey comes to mind because it has just recently come to my attention that New Jersey's Rutgers University is attempting to develop smog-resistant plants in order to help truck farmers to survive. A single ride at almost any hour of the day on the upper stretches of the New Jersey Turnpike makes it patently clear why Rutgers is interested in plants that can survive smog, and you don't have to be an expert loaded down with instruments to see that both refineries and automobiles play an important role in New Jersey's smog problem.

I should think that these two rich industries—simply in enlightened self-interest, if for no other reason—would do everything they reasonably could do to abate their own contribution to this growing environmental hazard, if only to avert the risk of drastic legislation which might seem to them much less reasonable in its demands. Many of the controls imposed on the refineries in Los Angeles also make economic good sense, too, in that they cut down losses from evaporation of a marketable product. And factory-installed blow-by devices for automobiles cost less than \$5 and also improve the car's function.

What could be more reasonable than for both the oil and automobile industries to follow throughout the country the splendid example set in Los Angeles?

NURSING SERVICES

In nursing services and resources, we gave them \$300,000 more than they asked for to try to develop a home care program that will reduce hospital costs.

The supply and quality of available nursing services continues to be a matter of foremost importance since these are fundamental to the success of all medical and health programs related to patient care. Already faced with shortages of nursing services, health administrators face new pressures in connection with the rising demand for nursing care for people sick in their homes. It is for this reason that the committee recommended an additional \$300,000 for the Division of Nursing, with the suggestion that it be used for traineeship grants. It is understood, however, that such grants are a long-term approach to this problem since they are primarily intended for the support of teaching, supervisory, and administrative personnel. It is recognized that there is also an immediate and urgent need for special training for those who give direct care to the patient. This includes learning to care for patients with complicated appliances, or needing special treatments, learning how to teach patients to care for themselves, and learning new methods of helping them back to as complete activity as possible. The intention of the committee is to provide some immediate help in developing the nursing resources needed for home care and aged health services in any appropriate manner.

In grants for hospital construction, we gave them the budget estimate which is what they had a year ago.

WATER POLLUTION AND SHELLFISH SANITATION

On the item of milk, food, interstate, and community sanitation, we have added \$1,800,000 for construction of two sanitary laboratories—one to be located on the east coast and the other on the gulf coast; and for water supply and water pollution control we allowed the full request which is an increase of \$3 million over the appropriation for 1961.

History seems to be repeating itself. In the early days of this century typhoid fever was the No. 1 public health problem of the Nation. People got it from the drinking water; they got it from shellfish that fed on polluted water. By the early 1920's the whole shellfish industry was threatened with extinction.

Then, at long last, something was done. The people of this Nation demanded and got drinking water that was free from harmful bacteria. The shellfish industry, working with the Public Health Service, regained its reputation for providing safe and nutritious food. In most parts of the country, there has not been a case of typhoid fever in years. But a lot of lives were lost, a lot of people suffered, before we got busy and did the things we knew ought to be done.

Well, you would think after 30 or 40 years, we would be a little more progressive when faced with a similar problem, hepatitis. That is a serious disease. It can be fatal. It can be chronic. It almost always results in a long and debilitating illness. Although it occurs in cycles, the cycles have been coming faster and faster in recent years and, in each cycle, the number of cases have been higher. So far this year, over 30,000 cases have been reported—a record high—and there are undoubtedly thousands of others that have not been reported. Moreover, the evidence is mounting that hepatitis is a water borne disease. We know that hundreds of people in Mississippi and New Jersey got hepatitis from eating raw shellfish harvested from contaminated waters. That problem was pinpointed and remedial action was taken. But what about the inland States where people seldom eat raw shellfish but where there has been an even higher incidence of hepatitis? Must we wait until there is absolute and final proof that polluted water is causing this illness and perhaps a lot of other virus diseases?

A better way, I say, is to take heed of the warnings we have had this year and step up our water pollution control and shellfish sanitation programs.

Sewage, chemicals, and radioactive pollutants are a fast-growing threat to the safety of our water supplies. They endanger all industries—and the shellfish industry is only one of many—that depend on clean, safe water in order to operate.

We need to strengthen our water pollution control program all along the line—better enforcement, more research, more personnel, more money for sewage treatment works.

We also need to step up shellfish sanitation research. It is a national disgrace that we now have only one small laboratory—out in Purdy, Wash.—making any study of how all this new and growing pollution, chemical and radiological as well as biological, may be affecting a basic food supply. We need shellfish research laboratories on the northeast and gulf coasts as well as in the Northwest. If we already had them, the tragedies of the oyster eaters in Pascagoula and the clam eaters in New Jersey might have been prevented.

It is no longer enough to curb the gross pollution that we know makes people sick. What we should be concerned about now is the water people use with confidence because they think it is safe. Probably most of it is safe, now, but you cannot wall off pollution with chemical treatment indefinitely. More and more people are going to find, as the shellfish harvesters in Raritan Bay found, that the water they thought was safe, was not safe. Just let that happen to the water supply of a big city—as it could happen—and imagine the consequences.

We have a clear duty to do everything within our power to see that the known methods of controlling pollution are fully applied and that research on ways to screen out viruses, chemical poisons, radioactivity, and other pollutants is speeded up. This bill represents our minimum responsibility to protect the water and water products used by American industry and by the American people.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The NIH stands today at the center of our national medical research effort. Over the years the Congress has responded vigorously to the public demand for an all-out attack on the dread diseases and the fearful disabilities which constantly threaten each of us. It has consistently acted on its firm conviction that the steady and orderly expansion of medical research is a sound investment in our future welfare and that the defense of the health of our people is no less vital or less urgent a national need than the defense of our shores and the air above us.

There is abundant evidence that this investment is paying off—first, and most importantly, in better health and better medical care for the American people but also in dollars and cents by steadily reducing the economic losses due to illness and premature deaths. The potential for even greater dividends is there if we will but maintain the momentum which has been so painstakingly built up.

This House can be justly proud of the aggressive part it has played in turning what was once a mere handful of laboratories, sheltering a few Public Health Service scientists anxious to do research, into the leading medical research institutions not only in this country but in the world. In field after field, a high proportion of the leading investigators are found among the clinicians and scientists whom NIH has developed either in its laboratories and Clinical Center at Be-

thesda or by supporting their work at other institutions through research grants or fellowships.

For my own part, I am especially proud to have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which must review the NIH budget during the 11 years in which most of the growth of the Institutes has taken place. I do not say this boastfully nor do I seek credit for any part I may have had in fostering this growth. I say it because I want you to know—and I want my constituents at home in Rhode Island to know—that no task in my 20 years of public service in the Congress has given me greater satisfaction than this opportunity to press forward a program whose success will so directly effect the well-being of every man, woman, and child. Each Member of this House has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The preamble of the Constitution says that one of its purposes is to "promote the general welfare." I believe that nothing will promote the general welfare more meaningfully than a program designed to promote sound health and a long and active life for each individual American.

It is therefore all the more astonishing to me that the executive branch, which, under our system of government, has the primary responsibility for developing national policy, has so consistently left it to the Congress to take the lead in stimulating the vital programs of the National Institutes of Health. Only once during the past 9 years—and that was 5 years ago—has the administration come forward with a budget which requested any substantial increase for the NIH programs, and even then the proposed amount was inadequate for the needs. In the past 3 years, the appropriation requests submitted to the Congress have simply tried to hold the budget line and have represented a retrenchment and a flat refusal to grasp the opportunities for progress which were so clearly at hand.

The budget sent to the Congress in January by the previous administration was in this same short-sighted pattern. Members of the House will recall that the budget message spoke of "a substantial program increase for medical research and training." But what did the budget actually provide? It provided for an appropriation which was \$20 million less than the Congress appropriated for 1961. The budget cutters created the illusion of an increase by putting their sharp pencils to work on the 1961 appropriation. To get a favorable comparison they cut out of the 1961 figure a lot of so-called nonrecurring items and so came up with an apparent increase.

They even deleted one program—grants for construction of cancer research facilities—started last year on a trial basis, that has now proved its worth and must be continued.

In order to have a fair basis for judging the adequacy of the budget, the committee asked the NIH to submit for the record a full and frank statement of the history of its budget requests for 1962. I wish every Member of this House would

study the facts submitted—as every member of the committee has studied them. The original estimates which the various Institutes submitted to the Director of NIH and which reflect the sound professional judgment of the program administrators on the actual needs of their programs were, in the aggregate, slashed 28 percent before they were acceptable to the past administration for submission to Congress.

I want to emphasize that the original figures prepared by the Institutes were not wild estimates but realistic assessments of what would be required to push forward with successful programs, to make available support for all first-class research projects that pass muster under NIH's rigid review system, and to meet training and construction needs. Each Institute Director when pressed during his testimony admitted—and some of them were very reluctant to tell the committee this—that his actual need, the money he could profitably invest in health research, was greater than his original request to NIH. This was confirmed by the expert witnesses in whose professional competence and personal integrity the committee has the highest confidence. They too, testified that the NIH budget, even as revised by the present administration, fell far short of our national requirements.

It is to the credit of the present administration that it recognized that the budget figures submitted to Congress before it took office were unrealistic. In response to a Presidential directive, the NIH submitted a revised estimate in February. It was virtually the same as the one it had originally submitted. This time the Public Health Service and the Department approved it without change but the Bureau of the Budget arbitrarily cut the figure by \$58 million. The revised estimate is therefore 9 percent short of NIH's conservative request and 23 percent short of what the Institutes originally asked for. I cannot tell you exactly how much more it falls short of what is actually needed if we are as serious as we ought to be about pushing these vital programs as hard as they can go.

Frankly, I am disappointed. I had hoped—not for partisan reasons but because I feel so strongly that we have no obligation more demanding of us than promoting the health and welfare of our people—that the new administration would develop a vigorous, forward-looking program to meet the needs of medical research.

I had hoped that we would see the new administration take real initiative in regard to the NIH programs. As it has not yet seen fit to do so, it remains the responsibility of the Congress to champion progress toward human health.

In doing so we are on solid ground. The programs which have been developed by the NIH, at the urging of the Congress, have demonstrated beyond question that they meet urgent and vital needs. They have demonstrated that they have earned the highest respect of the medical and other health professions and of the entire scientific community.

They have demonstrated that they enjoy widespread public support—that the taxpayers of this country feel that this is one Government activity which should not be stinted. They have demonstrated that they are productive—that the country is getting tangible returns on its investment of faith and funds in medical research. And they have demonstrated that the problems are as varied and complex as the need is urgent and vital—that we cannot stand pat but must expand our efforts as fast as our capabilities and opportunities develop.

A hold-the-line budget, or one with so small an increase as the Bureau of the Budget proposed, simply will not hold the line on the health frontier. It will leave serious gaps and may deny support to the very projects which might have resulted in the most dramatic new advance. In medical research, as in so many areas of science, the new breakthrough often comes in the most unexpected quarter.

A substantial expansion of the NIH support programs is also necessary if we are to provide research opportunities for the physicians and scientists who have been so painstakingly trained under the fellowship and training-grant programs of the National Institutes of Health. The Congress has appropriated a lot of money during the past 10 years to enable the NIH to support a wide range of research training programs. We took long-range measures to remedy significant manpower shortages or to broaden the capabilities of clinicians and medical scientists. It would indeed be false economy and seriously delay the attainment of our long-term objectives if these highly qualified investigators were now to be denied the opportunity for carrying out the research for which they were trained.

The clinical research center program must go forward. This program, for the support of general therapeutic and metabolic research centers, was launched to meet part of the need for facilities and is now in its second year. It is designed to serve investigators in a wide range of medical specialties and scientific fields by making available to them the specialized services and resources for complex studies of human patients. Awards have been made to 19 of these centers and a number of other very promising proposals are under review. The program has been enthusiastically received by the research community. We may confidently expect that it will result in significant advances toward the solution of a wide variety of disease problems.

The parallel program, launched this year, for the support of categorical clinical research centers—that is, centers devoted to a single category of diseases—is also responding to a widely felt and urgent need. This is evident from the many well-thought-out plans which have been received since this program was announced less than a year ago. The Cancer Institute has applications which clearly deserved support worth five times the amount available for this program. The Heart Institute had 40 requests for center grants

under its \$5 million appropriation. The Institute of Mental Health had 11 totaling over \$4 million and only had half a million to disperse. The Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, which also had only half a million dollars, had 14 applications totaling nearly \$3 million. These are programs that must obviously be continued.

The committee received evidence that there is a need to develop the center concept for anesthesiology. This is a field that is deeply concerned with the public health even though its importance has not been sufficiently understood. Competent surgery is impossible without competent anesthesia. If it is true that a Center will develop knowledge and save lives in heart disease and cancer, it would seem that the concept of a Center for anesthesiology will be most fruitful in the development of life saving skills.

The proper environment for intellectual growth, imaginative stimulation, and the development of scientific and clinical skills, requires the collection of the best available minds. These people must become available in such numbers that their daily duties in a department of anesthesiology can be performed satisfactorily and yet time be provided for study, reading, discussion and the gathering of new knowledge. Laboratories, technical assistance, equipment and office space must be made available for proper functioning. This well balanced environment of education, training of scientists, research work of the highest caliber and the best possible patient care constitutes an Anesthesiology Center.

The committee was informed that the shortage of facilities was one of the reasons which led the NIH to request no substantial increase in funds for the support of research-training. The training programs were greatly expanded in each of the past 3 years and their rapid growth has not only strained facilities but has created some administrative and planning problems which the schools must have time to resolve.

The only increases contemplated for 1962 are an additional \$2 million for the expansion of the graduate research training program and an increase of \$400,000 for the training of chairside assistants for dentists. We face a severe shortage of dentists and the use of chairside assistants will enable the dentist to work more efficiently and to handle more patients, by relieving him of a lot of routine, time-consuming tasks.

The total appropriation for training included in the bill is nearly \$14 million less than the amount appropriated last year but I want to assure the House that no cut-back of the research-training programs was intended by the Committee or suggested by NIH. The decrease is more than off-set by the non-recurring expenditure in 1961 of over \$16 million to get all these training programs on a forward-financing basis. The payment dates of these grants have now been adjusted so that all schools will know well before the beginning of the academic year exactly how much training money they will have available.

I do not want to leave the impression that all the needs for new research-training programs have been met. On the contrary, the Committee is convinced that further opportunities for building up our supply of competent research manpower exist and should be vigorously pursued. However, we have accepted the judgement of the Director of NIH that a year for assimilating the recent increases is desirable and that the direction of effort in the training area needs re-examination. The Committee has therefore directed the NIH to prepare, for next year's hearings, a balance sheet showing the estimated needs for research manpower 5 and 10 years from now so that the Congress will be able to assess what further expansion of the training programs, if any, is necessary.

I do not want to take the time of the House to dwell at length on the many successes of the past or to describe the many promising investigations that are underway. The highlights are laid out in the transcript of the hearings which every Member of this House should take time to review.

The record is impressive. There has been progress all along the line. We are moving rapidly ahead in getting a better understanding of the functioning of the human body. Knowledge of the specific causes of diseases—always the first step toward a cure—is increasing every day. There has been a substantial advance in ability to diagnose diseases, in the development of cures or more effective treatments, and, for some diseases, in the development of preventive methods. The clinicians and scientists supported by the NIH programs have created, tested, and perfected new drugs, new surgical procedures, and new diagnostic and therapeutic techniques.

It is impossible for a layman to describe in detail all that has been done during the past year but I would like to give you some examples of the sort of things that were reported to the committee during our hearings.

Scientists in the Cancer Institute have for the first time achieved a 5-year survival for a number of patients with a rare but deadly cancer by treating them wholly with drugs. There has been marked improvement in the survival rate of women with breast cancer through the use of a combination of surgery and drug treatment. Research into the relationship between viruses and cancer—a very hopeful area of research—has been greatly accelerated both in the Institute itself and through research grants.

We were told of an important discovery concerning the cause of the type of hardening of the arteries that usually leads to heart attacks and is one of our greatest killers. We were told of remarkable achievements in heart surgery, including the invention of an electronic device which, in certain types of heart failure can keep the heart beating until it is able to resume its own regular rhythm, and of the development of a method for massaging the heart to restore the flow of blood without the necessity of opening the chest.

Progress is being made in the study of cystic fibrosis and virus infections, in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and diabetes, and strokes, in the diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders, and in dozens of other disease areas and basic biological problems which I will not attempt to describe.

These advances are due as much to the high competence of NIH scientists in Bethesda as to the excellent work done by NIH grantees throughout the country. It is, therefore, particularly disturbing to me to learn that the Institute now faces a critical personnel problem.

The NIH, through its grant programs, has progressively strengthened the universities and medical schools and enabled them to embark on stimulating research programs. This was the aim of the Congress in appropriating funds for these grant programs and the House will, I am sure, take much satisfaction in their success. But one result of having strong research institutions throughout the country has been to heighten the competition for first-class men.

In this competition, the NIH, with only a few positions above the GS-15 level and a salary ceiling of \$19,000, is at a serious disadvantage.

During the past year NIH has lost a number of outstanding men with the result that there has been an unfortunate disruption of some of its research programs. In his testimony, the Director cited, as an example, one Institute in which an important program has been built around four really topflight scientists. All four were offered distinguished positions in some of our best universities at salaries the lowest of which was \$25,000 and these positions offered opportunities for part-time practice or consultation, which the government does not permit. Three of these men accepted. It is a fair guess that their annual income will be \$30,000 or better.

I might add that it speaks well for the spirit which prevails at NIH that the fourth man passed up the opportunity to increase his income by more than 50 percent and chose to stay in Bethesda.

Salary is not the only factor which governs the scientist job preference but it often determines the choice of men with families to support and children to send to college. It is clear to me that NIH must be given some flexibility in its salary structure so that it will retain its ability to attract and to hold men of superior talent.

The committee has therefore urged the Surgeon General and the Secretary to give prompt consideration to this problem and to make suitable recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees.

The impressive catalog of the achievements of NIH scientists, and of the several thousand outside investigators whose work NIH supports, has focused the committee's attention on a highly important aspect of research to which too little attention is given. This is the

communication of research results to medical practitioners.

The ultimate purpose of medical research is to make it possible for the medical and related health professions to give the American people more effective medical care. It is for this reason that the public supports research programs so enthusiastically and it is for this purpose that the Congress has made such sizable appropriations available for them.

Let no one forget that a research project does not end until the applicable results have been made readily available to medical practitioners throughout the country.

I do not pretend that this is a simple task. The mechanisms available at present—medical journals and other publications, symposia, medical conventions, and the other traditional means of professional communication—are slow and time consuming. They do not reach many practitioners who are either too busy to avail themselves of these means or are in remote areas not easily served by some of them.

But NIH has taken too little initiative in tackling the communication problem and in applying the great progress which has been made in communication techniques to the areas of its special interests and responsibilities. The committee feels that the possibilities of radically new approaches to the communication problem need to be thoroughly and systematically explored.

No funds have been specifically earmarked for this purpose in the 1962 appropriation but the committee has made it clear to NIH that it expects it to present, at next year's hearings, a well-considered plan which will set out the responsibilities of the various components of the Public Health Service and outline a vigorous developmental program in medical communication.

Another area which might profitably receive more attention—as NIH itself has recognized—is the application of physical science and engineering techniques to medical research problems. The possibilities range from the development of simple prosthetic devices to new surgical tools and elaborate automated laboratory instruments. We had some interesting testimony on this during the hearings from a couple of witnesses who showed the committee an ingenious mechanism for stapling together tiny blood vessels which cannot be sewn by hand and told us about a small electronic device which a heart patient might wear to warn him of overexertion.

During the course of the testimony by outstanding leaders in the fields of research, health services, and medicine, several witnesses emphasized the problem presented by the rapidly rising cost of present-day hospital care. Research has made possible rapid and far-reaching changes in the nature and character of hospital and medical practice but a major barrier to the widespread application of new techniques and research findings is the economic factor. It has therefore become urgently necessary to determine the most effective and eco-

nomical means of providing these new approaches to the diagnosis and treatment of disease in the hospital setting.

Witnesses emphasized that these approaches could best be developed by carrying out research in the design and construction of hospitals and treatment facilities to determine how patients, especially those requiring intensive treatment and 24-hour nursing services could best be handled to make the most use of research findings, and at the same time, reduce to a minimum the costs involved in treatment. The committee was much impressed by this testimony.

The committee has therefore included in the bill a new appropriation of \$10 million for grants for hospital research facilities. These funds would be used for making grants, as authorized by section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act. These grants would be made on a matching basis which would permit the use of Federal funds for not more than two-thirds of the cost of these facilities.

I have not attempted to discuss each of the many NIH activities for which funds are appropriated in this bill.

I have, for example, said nothing about the new institutional grants which were authorized by the Congress at the end of the last session. Five percent of the research project funds in this year's appropriation will be used to make these formula grants to medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health schools, and certain other institutions, for the general support of their research and research-training activities.

I have said nothing about the new program, which the Congress also approved last year, for making research career awards to selected investigators who want to devote their professional life to medical research.

Both of these programs are important steps in the development of even closer cooperative relations between the NIH and the institutions in which the bulk of non-Federal medical research is conducted. Both are described in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill.

The major items which the Bureau of the Budget so recklessly cut from the budget request and which the committee has restored are \$17,300,000 for the support of new research projects; \$9,500,000 for the institutional research grant program; \$14 million for the increased support of general therapeutic and metabolic research centers; \$7,500,000 for the enlargement of the categorical clinical research center program; and \$5 million for a new program for special research resources centers.

I am sure that the House will agree that these are important and necessary elements in the further growth of medical research which should not be impeded by the lack of essential funds.

These appropriations for the National Institutes of Health total \$636 million, including \$30 million for the sixth and final year of the program under the present Health Research Facilities Construction Act. This is a small sum in relation to the many vital needs which it serves. It is, my colleagues, the minimum investment we dare make to pro-

mote so fundamental an aspect of the general welfare as the people's health.

For grants for waste treatment works construction, we allowed the full \$50 million which is authorized by law.

For foreign quarantine activities, because of the increased foreign travel into this country, especially at airports, we allowed an increase of \$200,000.

In our hospital and medical care program, in order to make them first-class hospitals, we have raised that figure by \$500,000.

Four years ago the Surgeon General had special surveys made of the Public Health Service hospitals to determine their staffing needs. Even in view of the considerable needs that were demonstrated by these surveys, only modest increases were provided in fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 as the first three steps in a 4-year program to get the hospitals to an adequate staffing level. The 1962 budget provided for an increase of only 27 additional man-years of employment. In recognition of the inadequacy of the budget request the justifications stated the estimate provides for additional staff in the hospitals to the level approaching that previously identified as needed. Everyone who has made any serious study of the Public Health Service hospitals has concluded that there are two definite needs that are not yet filled. One is for additional operating staff and the other is for a good research program which will help in attracting and retaining good personnel as well as contributing to our conquest of disease. The committee will expect that the increase of \$1 million be allocated to these two purposes, giving first priority to operating personnel, thus assuring better care for patients.

In the National Institutes of Health, and this is where the largest increases are, we have raised the President's budget by \$58 million. This is a compromise figure. There were several figures the committee had to consider. The original estimates of the Institute directors, the original budget submitted in January, the revised President's budget, the public witnesses requests, and so forth. The amount of \$641 million included in the bill is the U.S. Public Health Service's final official request which was cut \$58 million by the Bureau of the Budget.

We have \$5 million for grant for construction of cancer research facilities on a nonmatching basis because we find time and time again one of the greatest needs in cancer research is lack of facilities.

Then we have \$10 million for research in the construction of hospital facilities. We are convinced it will cut the cost of care in hospitals, which is going up and up and up. About 65 percent of our bills in a hospital represent personnel costs, and hospital costs have gone up 300 percent in the last 20 years.

A 6-year study was carried on in Rochester, Minn. It was a controlled study of the circular hospital unit. It was developed that with this kind of new design, they could reduce the cost from \$54 per day to \$14. They claim 60 per-

cent of all hospital patients in any given area in the country require general hospital care. About 20 percent do not require as much hospital care, and there is 20 percent of the population in the hospital that demands that kind of intensive care which is the most expensive, that is, where you have a nurse around the clock—3 nurses which cost \$50 per day. In some of our Eastern States it will go as high as \$60 and \$70 a day. They found by building this circular hospital and having the nurses in the center where the nurse can see every patient and the patient can see the nurse, that they can bring about this economy and also that in one 8-hour shift a nurse will walk more than a mile less than she would in the old rectangular designed hospitals that have been built heretofore. They gave us other facts and figures which are in the hearings, but the main thing is that through a controlled study like this, they have been able to reduce the cost of nursing care for those people who need this most intensive care from \$54 to \$14 per day, or \$40 a day.

Grants for construction of health research facilities was allowed \$30 million. That is the authorization. That runs out this year, but legislation has been introduced to increase this to \$50 million. We gave them just what they asked for.

Scientific activities overseas: We reduced the request by \$2,084,000, but allowed \$4,293,000 more than they have this year.

National health statistics: We gave what they asked for.

The National Library of Medicine is the best library of its kind in the world. We gave just what they asked for.

For St. Elizabeths Hospital, we have increased this appropriation by \$166,000 to fully man the new buildings that have been built out there and provided 150 more positions for St. Elizabeths than called for in the budget.

Now we come to the Social Security Administration. We increased the limitation on "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," by \$320,000 to buy some land adjacent to their site in Baltimore. It undoubtedly will be needed in the near future to enable them to build larger quarters. We were told that if we did not buy the land now it would surely cost much more later on.

For grants to States for public assistance, we gave them the request of \$2,285 million. This is the largest single item in the bill, and there is absolutely nothing we can do about it, for the law provides that if the States put up their money, under the law, the Federal Government is bound to match it. In the present bill it is \$2,285 million. There is nothing we can do about it unless we change the law.

We reduced the request for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance \$79,000.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

For salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, we approved the request.

It has been suggested to every Secretary of the Department of Health, Edu-

cation, and Welfare and every administrator of the Federal Security Agency that it is wrong to relegate the Children's Bureau to a third level position. The committee strongly feels that the responsibilities and the activities of the Children's Bureau are of sufficient importance to warrant placing it on a level directly below the Secretary rather than being just another office in the Social Security Administration. The Secretary has always had the authority to make such an organizational change and give the Children's Bureau the recognition that it deserves.

The Committee also feels that the Children's Bureau should be given more responsibilities for research than it has in the past. The research programs of the National Institutes of Health have been primarily in the disease areas and the Committee is of the opinion that this is as it should be. There has been some tendency however during the past few years to do more work in the behavioral research area especially in connection with children. This, it seems to the committee, should more properly be the role of the Children's Bureau. When this was discussed during the hearings, considerable doubt was expressed as to the authority of the Children's Bureau to make research grants in this area. While much important research could be done directly, a well rounded research program should include extramural activities. The committee is especially anxious that the Children's Bureau be given a more important role in connection with the problem of juvenile delinquency. It may well be that the Committee itself is as much at fault as anyone for the current situation, for the committee encouraged the Mental Health Institute in this field rather than attempting to lay a foundation, and encouraging the Department to take the steps necessary, for such a program in the Children's Bureau. However, it will be expected that the Department give serious consideration to this matter during the next year and if necessary seek legislation to make a well-rounded program possible; and be prepared to present such a well-rounded program to the committee next year.

We increased grants to States for maternal and child welfare by \$2,350,000.

The net increase over the amount requested represents an increase of \$1 million each for the three original categories and a reduction of \$650,000 in the amount requested for the new activity "Research or demonstration projects in child welfare." There was \$1 million requested for the later program of which \$350,000 was estimated to be necessary for expenses in fiscal year 1962, and \$650,000 was for obligations to be incurred in 1963 and succeeding years. The committee does not feel that it is wise to deviate from the standard procedure of providing funds for such activities on an annual basis, thus assuring a review at least once each year.

The authorization for each of the three original categories is \$25 million. For "Maternal and child health services" the bill provides \$23 million compared with \$18,167,000 available for 1961. The bill

includes \$25 million for "Crippled children's services" compared with \$20 million available for fiscal year 1961. The bill includes \$18,750,000 for "Child welfare services" compared with \$13,666,000 available for 1961. Over the last several years these appropriations have not even kept up with the increase in child population and the increase in costs, let alone provide for any improvement in these services. In one category the figures show that in the decade from 1950 to 1960 these appropriations actually decreased \$6 per year per 1,000 children. In view of these facts the committee feels that this increase is rather modest.

In the past far too little attention has been paid to the plight of unwed mothers in the teenage group and their children. Despite the efforts of welfare agencies and law enforcement officials, there continues to be a thriving black market in babies. This is made possible to a large extent by the lack of decent programs for young unwed mothers and their children. The committee will expect that the Children's Bureau use a portion of the increased funds in fiscal year 1962 to get effective programs started to better deal with the problem, and to rehabilitate these mothers so that they may become a part of decent society rather than going on to further degradation as now so often happens.

For cooperative research in social security we have given them \$350,000 more than they had in 1961, but \$800,000 less than the request. The reduction made by the committee represents funds that were requested for obligation beyond fiscal year 1962. As I have already mentioned the committee does not feel that it is wise to deviate from the standard procedure of appropriating funds for such programs on an annual basis.

Then there are several items for which we allowed the budget request without change: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner; American Printing House for the Blind; Gallaudet College, the only college in the world for deaf people; and Howard University.

PROGRAM IN AGING

We have included the full amount of the budget request for the Office of the Secretary.

During the hearings I expressed deep concern, disappointment, and dissatisfaction with the Department's activities in aging. There is no clearly defined program and little evidence of leadership directed toward positive action following the White House Conference on Aging.

The report of the Conference, "The Nation and Its Older People," transmitted to the President, April 10, 1961, is not the blueprint for action the country was promised during the years preceding the Conference and in the hundreds of meetings that were held throughout the Nation in preparation for it.

The report at best is little more than a directory of participants, a collection of general policy statements, and a wide assortment of recommendations that have little significance without some in-

dication of the plans that will convert them into action.

Unless a more useful document is prepared for the American public with a determination on the part of HEW to follow through, the White House Conference on Aging will have been not only one of the most expensive, but the least productive of the national conferences, and could become one of the cruelest hoaxes ever perpetrated against the Nation's senior citizens. Immediate action must be taken to develop a program that will achieve the aims and purposes set forth in the bill which established the conference.

The Office of Field Administration asked for 18 new positions, for an analyst and a secretary in each regional office. We denied that request. The total reduction was \$138,000.

In related agencies, the National Labor Relations Board shows a cut of \$667,000. We explain this in the report.

That is, I think, the main changes we made in this bill.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. On page 9 of the report, at the bottom of the page, you indicate a decrease of a million dollars from the amount requested for national defense fellowships.

Did the gentleman explain why there was that reduction in the amount requested?

Mr. FOGARTY. This has been one of the more controversial sections of the Office of Education. It has received some bad publicity with reference to certain of the fellowships that were granted in connection with the teaching of folklore and other things like that. As a result, this million dollars was cut. I may say to the gentleman there were some who wanted to cut a lot more.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. On the same page 9 of the committee report, the committee has reported on funds for Public Law 874. The funds appropriated are simply for the permanent section of the law which applies 100 percent to the children who live on Federal property and their parents live on Federal property. The Committee on Education is working on a bill which will extend the section B authorization for children who live on private property although their parents work on Federal installations. If that bill is passed, does the gentleman expect to take the initiative to bring a supplemental appropriation bill in during this session to provide the funds required?

Mr. FOGARTY. We would expect the administration to send up a request for a supplemental bill, and I hope we will give them every dime they are entitled to under the law. That has been my position since 1950.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appreciate that. The gentleman from Rhode Island has been a leader in this field for Public Law 874. The reason I raised the point is due to the fact that some school dis-

tricts are having great difficulty and will have more difficulty unless those funds are appropriated in the current session.

Mr. FOGARTY. I can assure the gentleman from California that when this legislation is extended we will try to do everything we can to get the appropriation to meet the law as extended.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say he gave the Office of the Secretary of Labor a special assistant as requested by the Department and as described in the hearings?

Mr. FOGARTY. A special assistant, yes.

Mr. GROSS. A special assistant to the assistant Secretary?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. You gave them an assistant?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That was for the purpose of maintaining proper relations with other Departments?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

Mr. GROSS. You did not give them this assistant?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, not for liaison work with other Departments.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. I do not know of any other department that has to have a special assistant to maintain proper relations with other departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that you increased the number of labor attachés in foreign countries?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. All this does is to provide more funds for the people here in Washington. These people in the Department of Labor I might say have been doing a good job. They asked for a \$132,000 increase. We allowed them an increase of \$66,000, half of what they requested. The Labor attachés are appointed through the Secretary of State. These people in the Department of Labor also back up the delegates to the International Labor Organization. That meeting is going to be held next month in Geneva.

Mr. GROSS. So they did get some more money for the reason stated in the hearings, because the Labor Department has acquired heavy new responsibilities in respect to the development of U.S. foreign policy.

Since when did the Department of Labor start becoming a vital factor in foreign policy?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know how vital it is.

Mr. GROSS. Well, having heavy new responsibilities.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought the witness gave a very good account of the International Labor Organization. I thought what he said made sense; that in some

foreign countries many of the leaders in government came up from the ranks of labor, and it is good to have people who know the problems of labor in these countries, like Africa, for example.

Mr. GROSS. Did we have labor attachés in Cuba, and if we did, what happened to that situation?

Mr. FOGARTY. We do not have a labor attaché in every country in the world.

Mr. GROSS. Now, I understand from the hearings that these labor attachés are trained some place; they are given training some place. Can the gentleman tell me where that school may be and who operates the training school?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Department of State, I assume.

Mr. GROSS. The Department of State?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. The labor attachés are appointed by the Department of State. They are not appointed by the Department of Labor, and there is nothing in here for labor attachés; not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. No money in this bill for labor attachés?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

Mr. GROSS. Even through the Department of Labor?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. This section in the Department of Labor has been headed by Mr. Lodge for the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. GROSS. Is Lodge the man who has had such wonderful training through his father in operating the giveaway program?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; he still is.

Mr. GROSS. He still is what?

Mr. FOGARTY. He is still head of this program for the Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I have no doubt of that. If you can dig up any more internationalists to run this show, they will be dug up.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think he has done a very good job. He is a very energetic young man, and I think he is putting some sense into this program. He is doing a good job.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think it ought to be said that in many countries which have strong labor movements and sometimes labor governments, most of the important and effective work that has been done in combating communism has been done by men coming out of our own labor movement. They understand the kind of fight that has to be made because they went through the battle of resisting Communist infiltration of some unions in this country. They have exerted a constructive and helpful influence in keeping several other countries in the free world instead of having their will as free nations gradually eroded with inevitable movement toward or into the other camp. These labor leaders ought to be commended for the beneficial work they have done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder

if the Committee on Foreign Affairs called Mr. Goldberg up to tell them how to handle these foreign aid bills and so on and so forth.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether they did or not, but it might have been a good idea, because he is a very able man.

Mr. GROSS. From what he said it would be a good idea?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Goldberg is going to be one of our great Secretaries of Labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Speaking about Mr. Goldberg, he just testified here last week that all the jobs even in the defense plants should belong to union men. And, when the gentleman from Minnesota talks about the State Department and the Foreign Service, knowing what we do know, I wonder if the gentleman has forgotten about Walter Reuther's training in Russia, together with his brother, when they were working in the factories.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know where he got his training but wherever he got it, it has stood him in good stead. I do not think there is one any more willing or who has done more to fight communism in this country than Walter Reuther.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the second paragraph on page 41 of the report:

The bill includes \$95,000, the amount of the request, as the final amount necessary to liquidate contract authority previously granted for the construction of the auditorium-fine arts building.

I wonder if the gentleman could tell me the progress of the program for the auditorium-fine arts building, for Howard University—and just what the liquidation of the contract authority portends for the future. The gentleman knows of my long interest in Howard University.

Mr. FOGARTY. We chided them a little bit on their presentation because in all of their building programs they have been a year or two behind. But we have given them enough to complete the building.

Mrs. CHURCH. Then there is nothing portentous about the term liquidation of contract; nothing to indicate that completion of the building will be interfered with?

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, no. We are just finishing the financing.

Mrs. CHURCH. There is no intent to phase out any part of the programs?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. We gave them everything they asked for.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think they deserve it. I think they are doing a good job at Howard University. That is becoming a really great school, and this Congress

and past Congresses have helped tremendously in this regard.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In the report on page 22 I notice the committee recommended that 5 percent of the total appropriation for research grants be allowed in fiscal year 1962 for institutional grants to public and other non-profit institutions. Is it the intention of the committee to increase this gradually up to the 15 percent that was originally authorized?

Mr. FOGARTY. That would be based on the testimony next year. When the act passed Congress a year ago the plan of administration called for 5 percent for the first year, 10 percent the second year, and then it will go up to 15 percent.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It will be the intention of the Chairman of the committee to recommend that the authorization be raised to the 15 percent figure?

Mr. FOGARTY. Unless something happens to indicate this program is not an efficient way to carry out the research program.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman and I commend him for his outstanding work in this field of medical research.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate and commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the Members of his committee for their work not only this year but down through the years, which I think has been very thorough. The bills that have been brought to this floor have reflected painstaking inquiry and a thorough-going dedication to constructive accomplishments in the field in which they are working. I think they have done a magnificent job.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my friend from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] in expressing personal appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island and his subcommittee of the fine bill which they have reported and of their very informative report.

I hope when we go back into the House some of the sections of this report, particularly those dealing with cancer and with infant mortality may be made a part of the record of these proceedings because I think the gentleman is bringing to the attention of the House some very significant and basic information. The information on the subject of air pollution control, indicating the probability that many deaths are occurring across the country because of polluted air, is vital information. There is vital information in the report on the subject of infant mortality. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us how the Public Health Service accounted to the com-

mittee for the fact that we are witnessing an increase in infant mortality in the United States.

Mr. FOGARTY. They did not give us a very good explanation. In the report we encourage the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau to make a complete study on the rise in infant mortality. It was brought out in the hearings, however, that the States have some responsibility in this, also. There is a great range in the figures. The low is 20 per 1,000 and it goes up to 43 per 1,000 live births in the highest State. Some States are not doing a very good job in this particular area.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I know that many of us will be awaiting with a great deal of interest the report of the Public Health Service on this analysis that I am glad to see the committee is having made; and I think the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, first may I compliment the gentleman on what I think is a very fine report and a very fine bill.

Regarding the Department of Labor appropriations as set out in Report No. 392, page 5, of the Appropriations Committee, I note that the committee has provided for a substantial increase in the suggested appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards. As the Members know, the Special Subcommittee on Labor will begin hearings Wednesday, May 24, on amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act which is administered by the Bureau of Labor Standards.

I think the Members, therefore, would be interested in comments contained on page 5 of the report with respect to the need for amendments to the act. The report states:

Activities required of this Bureau by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act cost approximately \$500,000 per year. Secretary Mitchell stated that this act provides only "a shameful illusion" and "no persuasive deterrent to those who wish to ignore its provisions, or to manipulate or embezzle funds." When asked his opinion of this statement, Secretary Goldberg said "I join in that statement 100 percent." The committee does not like to see funds wasted and hopes that legislative action will be taken to correct this matter.

I would like to emphasize the last statement wherein the committee hopes that legislative action will be taken to correct the deficiencies in the present law. This becomes very meaningful in view of our hearings to begin next week on proposed amendments, and I hope all interested Members will contact the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was testified by Secretary Mitchell a year or two ago that this law did not really accomplish anything. We asked the present Secretary of Labor this year if he agreed with Mr. Mitchell and he said he did. That is why we put it in the report that way.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, one thing that has bothered me over a considerable period of time has been the method of processing the total and permanent disability claims under the social security law. It has caused a great many complaints to be made to my office and many other Congressmen tell me that they have had similar difficulty. A great deal of time is spent by the congressional staffs in working on social security cases. I think this has been brought about partly because of the system by which the claims are processed.

The claimant makes out his claim with the district office of the Social Security Administration. Under the law, of course, he is expected to make out his case, but unless a man was given assistance it would be impossible for many of them to make out their claims. The district office does assist the claimant. However, he does not have the same assistance that a veteran receives where there is generally a county service officer, a veterans contact man in the Veterans' Administration office, and a service officer in the various veterans' organizations, locally, to assist the claimant.

After the claim has been processed in the district office, it goes to the State vocational rehabilitation office, which decides whether the claim should be paid. From there, it goes to the social security office at Baltimore, which again reviews the case and claim. While they have no authority to set aside a denial of the claim which they consider erroneous, they send back all claims which they think are wrong to the State office. They have only authority to set aside the allowance of a claim they think is erroneous. The evidence shows that the State office had to reinvestigate or call for a reinvestigation in some 55 percent of the claims, and the Baltimore office sent back to the States approximately 15 percent of their claims.

This process of going through the State office causes a delay of from 60 to 90 days, costing \$19 million, and makes one think that what is everybody's business is nobody's business.

Thus it must be obvious that the system is cumbersome, inefficient, and wasteful administratively. We have the unique situation where State vocational rehabilitation agencies, with no monetary interest, determine the eligibility of claimants applying for benefits under a Federal program. Since the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the expenses of the State agencies, and since the State agencies have no monetary stake in the program, there is obviously no incentive on the part of the State agencies to economize, or even operate efficiently, except the personal pride of the individuals.

Some have sought to defend this administrative monstrosity with the argument that it requires the applicants to come in contact with the facilities for rehabilitation and so be rehabilitated. The facts are that through this program 1,317,000 persons were referred to State vocational rehabilitation agencies through June 30, 1960, and only 6,600—

one-half of 1 percent—were successfully rehabilitated. It is worse than a failure from the standpoint of vocational rehabilitation, and thus attempts to make claims examiners out of people trained in rehabilitation. This diverts trained persons from this field that already has a shortage of such manpower.

Many formal and informal studies have been made of this matter and practically all have found serious shortcomings. On March 4, 1959, when the Committee on Appropriations was holding hearings on the budget for fiscal year 1960, Mr. Mitchell, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, was asked:

What is your personal opinion of bringing the States into this?

Mr. Mitchell replied:

My personal opinion is that if this were asked at the beginning of the program, I would have recommended against it, and quite strongly, because I think it violated some of the fundamental principles of Federal-State relations in that, for one thing, it gave the States an opportunity to write blank checks against Federal funds.

When asked, in connection with the hearings this year, Mr. Mitchell indicated that his opinion in the matter had not changed.

On October 23, 1959, the Comptroller General of the United States transmitted to the Speaker of the House a copy of the report on the General Accounting Office's study of this program. The summary of principal findings and recommendations included the following:

Our review indicated that the handling of applications for disability benefits by the State agencies is cumbersome and results in unnecessary costs and excessive processing time. An evaluation of the present requirements of law, that disability determination must be made by State agencies, is needed.

Last summer and fall, the survey and investigations staff of the Committee on Appropriations made a detailed study of this program and came up with similar conclusions and recommendations, with considerable detail to document the fact that this is a most unsatisfactory program from many points of view.

This report brought out the fact that budget controls were weak and applied differently in different States, that in many States records were insufficient to allow for a definite separation of funds which were spent for State programs and funds which were spent on Federal programs of determining disability, and that there was absolutely no uniformity in fee schedules for medical examinations.

Just to take the medical fee schedules as one example, it was pointed out that of 54 contracting State agencies, 39 are free to revise the schedules used in their program without even relating them to other programs in the States. Among the various State agencies, some use the workmen's compensation program fee schedule, others use Veterans' Administration fee schedules, and one uses Blue Shield, but most set their own, which are revised from time to time, with no uniformity in the base schedule or the revisions as compared to what other States

are doing. One thing is common—the fees and other costs are continuing to go up. While the cost per case for fiscal year 1960 was budgeted at \$32.50, it actually amounted to \$36 by the time the year was over. The estimates for fiscal year 1961 were based on a presumption that the cost would average \$36 per case during that fiscal year; however, at the time of the staff's inquiry the unit cost had already risen to \$41 per case. In 1957, the cost per case averaged \$17.64. In just 4 years the cost has gone up over 130 percent.

While just the unnecessary expense of this program is certainly sufficient cause for change, the same basic administrative requirements which lead to waste of funds also lead to undue delays in claims processing, inconsistent determinations as to eligibility, and in general lead to unsatisfactory and inequitable treatment of claimants.

Coupled with these difficulties is an appeals system which leaves much to be desired. The Appeals Council is technically a part of the Office of the Secretary; however, the Council and all employees are paid from Social Security Administration funds and are actually more under the supervisory control of the Social Security Administration than under the Secretary. This cannot help but influence appeals decisions.

If any further proof of the weakness of this whole system were needed, one has only to look at the sorry court record to find it. According to recent statistics, of the cases that were taken to court, 173 had been affirmed and 103 were reversed. This is not to say the court found that in 173 cases the appeals were correctly decided, but only that the court found there was sufficient evidence in the case to sustain a finding. Thus in over a third of the cases the court found that there was not even sufficient evidence to sustain a finding. This is practically the same as the court's setting aside the verdict of a jury. It certainly is not only an indication, it is proof that there is something really wrong with this program.

On the whole, I think the social security district offices and the review office in Baltimore are doing a good job under the circumstances. I think that the problem is the system under which they work. The following facts will show that something must be wrong with the system besides the expense and unnecessary delay.

There are approximately 30,000 applicants each month under the disability provisions of the act. Of this number, approximately 19,000 will be allowed and 11,000 will be disallowed. Out of the group whose claims are disallowed, about 3,000 will want their cases reconsidered. Of that number, about 40 percent, or 1,300, will have their claims allowed on reconsideration. Out of the 60 percent, or 1,700 disallowed, about 700 will go on to a requested hearing before a referee. Of that number, about 200, or 30 percent of those whose claims were disallowed, will have them allowed before the referee of Appeals Council.

Then, a small percentage go to court, and of that number over one-third have

their claims allowed. This leaves one to wonder about the 8,000-plus whose claims are denied and never ask for reconsideration or appeal. Undoubtedly, many claims for disability are filed which are unfounded and should not be allowed; but when 40 or so percent of those who ask for a rehearing after their claims have been denied are then allowed the claims on reconsideration, and the claims of 30 percent of those who have had them denied on reconsideration are allowed by the referee or the Appeals Council—and then over one-third of those disallowed by the Appeals Council are allowed by the court—one wonders, if these 8,000 who did not ask for reconsideration had the ability or the assistance to exercise their rights, just how large a percentage of these disallowed claims would eventually have been allowed.

I want my Government to be a fair government, but in this case I am certain in my own mind that justice is being denied a great many people. Certainly if there is any group of people in our Nation that deserves just treatment it is this group of disabled who in so many cases are unable to help themselves. In the interests of efficient government, in the interests of saving the taxpayers millions of dollars now being wasted, and for just plain humanitarian reasons, I hope that we will not put off much longer straightening out the administrative mess that we have helped create in connection with this program.

(Mr. DENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to say to the gentleman that no Member of the Congress performs a more useful and valuable work than the gentleman now in the well of the House. It was a stimulus to national morale, and an example of dedication to the public service over and beyond personal ambition and aims when the gentleman offered almost on a silver platter a seat in the other body, elected to remain here in this body to continue the great and dedicated work he is doing, for which the American people always will be indebted to him.

I have received a number of telegrams from my constituents interested in the continuance on an enlarged scale of apprenticeship training. I commend the gentleman and his able colleagues on the subcommittee for acting favorably in that area.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. We increased that amount by \$500,000 over the budget.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I have here a telegram from the chancellor of the University of Chicago, reading:

Strongly urge restoration of funds for support of NDEA, title IV fellowships which are of great importance to programs being financed jointly by the Government and the universities.

Is that covered in the present bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, not to his liking.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does my colleague disagree with the eminent chancellor of the University of Chicago?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is a unanimous report. There was some give and take on this, and what we came out with is the best compromise we could agree on.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate that in the grinding of the legislative mills compromises sometimes become necessary, but I do hope that in the other body the funds will be restored as recommended by the chancellor of the University of Chicago who is an outstanding scientist as well as educator, and the House conferees will agree to accept such restoration, if in the judgment of the other body, it is made. I know that my colleagues on the subcommittee always will welcome the counsel of the Nation's educators and scientists, among whom the chancellor of the University of Chicago is pre-eminent.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. He knows that I am interested in what procedure the Government follows in connection with hiring older people. I note on page 41 of the report this short paragraph that I would like to read:

During the hearings the chairman of the subcommittee expressed deep concern, disappointment and dissatisfaction with the Department's activities in aging. There is no clearly defined program and little evidence of leadership directed toward positive action following the White House Conference on Aging.

There has been a lot of talk about helping the aged to obtain work. I personally have undertaken from time to time to ascertain from the various departments of the Government the number of people actually hired 45 years of age or older and 60 years of age or older. It is very clear that when one seeks those actual figures it is quite difficult to get any figures. The heads of the departments will always tell you, "We have a policy of not discriminating against older people," but when you ask for figures they do not seem to have them and are not interested in obtaining them. The gentleman has undertaken to help me get those figures, and I want to thank him again for that, but I hope too, that a new effort will be made to find out whether or not the various departments are in truth and in fact following their own policies about hiring older people.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I also would like to commend the gentleman on the work he has done with his committee in bringing the pending bill before us. On page 17 of the report, you speak of the need for shellfish laboratories on the east coast

and the gulf coast. I believe this is in the amount of \$1,820,000. I believe this came about as the result of the hepatitis outbreak in the shellfish and oyster industry.

Mr. FOGARTY. That has been traced to oysters in the Mississippi area, and clams in the New York, New Jersey area.

Mr. GIAIMO. On the east coast near Milford, Conn., the Fish and Wildlife Service specializes in shellfish and oyster culture where we have a great industry in shellfish and oysters. At the present time there is pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a bill which will enlarge the functions of this fish and wildlife agency in Milford, which will initiate a research project into the whole area of the oyster industry and the commercial production of shellfish and oysters.

Mr. FOGARTY. This bill would have no effect on that at all.

Mr. GIAIMO. Would this have any effect on that?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman raised the question with me a couple of days ago, and I went to the trouble to get the details on this subject. We have complete cooperation between the Public Health Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service. There is no duplication of effort there at all. But they work together and the people of the Public Health Service are backing this bill that you speak of.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I commend the gentleman and the committee for giving cognizance to the extremely serious problems of automation and recommending additional funds for the Department of Labor in the retraining of industrial workers. I note on page 57 of the hearings the gentleman states and I quote:

We have talked a lot about retraining workers during the last 4 or 5 years, but I do not think anything very worthwhile has materialized.

I wonder if the gentleman does not feel this is in an area where we could make a larger investment?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sure we could. We have been asking the Secretary of Labor every year to spend more time and effort in this area. Everyone agrees more should be done, but nothing much has been accomplished.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The records of the Congress will show that the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island has been closely associated with me in our effort to do something about the education program of the United States. I am just a little bit surprised to see reductions made in the appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I said a while ago, this is a unanimous report and, therefore, a compromise report.

Mr. BAILEY. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island that my Committee on General Education will begin hearings on amendments to the Defense Education Act on Tuesday of next week, and we will probably be talking to you a little bit later.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island for the work he has done in this field and for the report he has given us today on the floor. In line with what previous gentlemen have said, I thank him for remaining on this side of the Congress and for the help he has given me and for the stature he gives to the State of Rhode Island by virtue of his position here in the Congress.

(Mr. ST. GERMAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank my colleague.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island and the subcommittee and the staff for the excellent report on this bill.

[Mrs. SULLIVAN addressed the Committee. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman will recall Dr. Ralph A. Sawyer, vice president of the Department of Research at the University of Michigan who appeared following me and Senator Hart before the gentleman's subcommittee, to urge the removal of the 15-percent limitation on overhead expenses.

His testimony appears at page 692 of the hearings with regard to section 204, page 45 of the bill. I gather that no action was taken by the subcommittee with respect to either the removal of that limitation of 15 percent or an increase in the percentage. Was this considered by the committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, it was considered. I think the gentleman from Michigan made a very excellent statement, and the doctor he brought with him from the University of Michigan made a fine statement. We did not, however, have the votes in the committee to raise the 15 percent. Some members wanted to cut it below 15 percent. The result is that we have a compromise agreement to hold what we have.

Mr. MEADER. I take it the gentleman himself is receptive to the suggestion and that he himself favors some relaxation of this limitation.

Mr. FOGARTY. There are many who feel that direct aid to medical schools is

the answer. I think the quicker we get that the better off we are going to be. I think we should have some legislation along that line.

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DURNO. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island. As he may know, I have been a practicing physician for 35 years. I realize the difficulty the gentleman has in getting this appropriation. I am interested in knowing how you go about justifying the \$58 million in excess of the request. What is the authority for the increase?

Mr. FOGARTY. First, we asked the various institute directors what they thought they needed. We got their estimates. Then we asked the Surgeon General what his recommendation was for those institutes. He generally cuts the requests by a few million dollars. Then it goes to the Department and to the Bureau of the Budget and they cut it further. Sometimes in the Bureau of the Budget it is just an arbitrary cut to come within a ceiling.

After listening to all these Government people we have some of the outstanding people in these various categories come in, at their own expense, and they tell us what they think ought to be done in these various areas.

This amount of \$641 million is the exact amount the Surgeon General said was required. This was the compromise we reached.

I wanted to include \$200 million over the budget. I think we could spend \$200 million more very effectively.

Mr. DURNO. This is an emotional matter. I agree that very much more could be spent, but I would like to ask one final question: Did organized medicine ask for any of this?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. They had an opportunity. We never refuse anyone from appearing before our committee and testifying. We have talked to them from time to time, and in the research field, we find ourselves in agreement with the organized professional associations.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. First, I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, and the subcommittee for its work. I have read a great deal of the hearings and I find them most enlightening. But there are three major cuts which are distressing to me. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, it is my intention to follow the lead of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

I am concerned, however, about the reduction of a million dollars in fellowships under the National Defense Education Act. This act is barely underway. If, indeed, its original purpose was meritorious at all, they should be given more now.

The second cut is a reduction of \$350,000 in the request for institutes for the guidance of personnel, something very badly needed throughout the whole system and in the National Defense Education Act. Many of us felt that the original amount provided and requested was too little.

The third one is the \$500,000 cut in the salaries and expenses section. This would retard the work of the educational statistics group, as well as the college information center, which is vitally needed.

I think that these three cuts do great violence to the program of education under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I observe in the report that the committee has included a provision of \$1,800,000 for the establishment and operation of shellfish laboratories.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BATES. I wish to commend the committee for that. We have a very serious problem up there. I am well acquainted with the situation on the east coast. I thank the gentleman for including this in the report.

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express approval of the report of the House Committee on Appropriations, presented by my colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. Many of the provisions of this bill, in addition to benefiting all the people of this Nation, are of special interest to the people of Rhode Island. An example of this is the inclusion of funds in the Office of the Secretary of Labor to institute an effective program for the training of men and women for skilled industrial positions. As the committee's report points out, this is of particular importance in areas where migration of industry and other economic factors have raised unemployment to high levels. The value of such a program cannot be too highly estimated, because the benefits which will accrue to those areas where chronic unemployment exists are innumerable.

With respect to the all-important field of education, grants for library services, assistance for school construction, expansion of teaching and education for the mentally retarded, and those with speech and hearing defects, and provision for a program in cooperative research are of the greatest necessity.

Also, funds for accident prevention, chronic diseases and health of the aged, community health research, control of tuberculosis, nursing services and resources, hospital construction activities, and other health services are important to the well-being of Rhode Island as

well as that of the entire country. The expansion of programs for cancer research, mental health activities, research in heart disease, arthritis, and other illnesses are essential phases of integrated, realistic health planning.

I am very happy to note that funds have been recommended for the establishment of a Public Health Service shellfish laboratory in the East. This will greatly benefit Rhode Island due to the importance of the shellfish industry to my State and the danger to health which results from the contamination of water in which many shellfish are to be found. Progress toward providing solutions for this problem is very desirable and of great concern to Rhode Island.

The expansion of services under the Social Security Administration through increased grants to States for public assistance, maternal and child welfare, and provision for cooperative research in social security, continues and increases the benefits our citizens enjoy under our social security system.

The committee is to be commended for its realistic appraisal of human needs and its determination to meet these needs. Such farsighted judgments deserve careful consideration and approval by the Congress.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee submitting the report on the bill covering appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, I should like to express my strong support of the committee's actions and recommendations and urge that the House approve them. I have served on this committee in the 83d, 85th, 86th as well as now in the 87th Congresses, and I am acutely aware of how the programs of these agencies directly affect the lives and welfare of every man, woman, and child in this country. The Members of this Congress are also well aware of what these programs mean to each of our citizens, ranging as they do from unemployment compensation to such things that shall have a profound effect on our future as education and medical research.

NATION'S HEALTH IMPORTANT

There are many areas represented in these appropriations that I could comment on, but I would like now to discuss some of the National Institutes of Health activities not covered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in his remarks. We give special emphasis to the appropriations of NIH for a number of reasons. First, because these appropriations support a series of programs which are of fundamental importance to the health and well-being of this Nation. This is an area of the national interest with which I have had a constant concern since my election to the Congress. The research programs carried out by the National Institutes of Health have made possible a substantial expansion of knowledge concerning disease and health problems. The continued support of the programs will substantially increase the probability of major discoveries which will have as powerful effect upon the

health status of the Nation in the future as the discovery of the antibiotics and immunizing vaccines have had in the past. Second, I am convinced that the people of this country are fully in support of the continued effort to enlarge the Nation's medical research program. Those of us on the committee who work closely with the research and related programs served by these appropriations can attest—simply from the amount and nature of our mail from the general public—to the desire for a greater effort in medical research. One thing that is generally acknowledged in this outpouring of sentiment for planned and productive medical research is that the United States is second to none in this field. Of this we can be proud because a healthy people, is a strong people, and a healthy nation is a strong nation. If we are to remain free from today's health hazards and from those that may involve from today's environment and if we are to remain free from those who seek to dominate us, then the answer is quite clear:

We must continue to make this investment commensurate with our intellectual and financial capacity to seek, find, and apply new knowledge for the benefit of man.

A third reason for my interest in the programs of the National Institutes of Health that the Members of this Congress should be aware of is this: For a number of years, our committee and those who administer the programs of the National Institutes of Health have been agreed that there is one key factor in developing a logical, orderly, fruitful national medical research program, namely, balance. Support of current research must be balanced by efforts to enlarge the medical research manpower of the future through training. These programs in turn must be completed by efforts to provide additional research facilities through construction—particularly for the highly specialized and complex facilities which research in major disease programs such as cancer require.

BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

During the past 2 years it has become more and more evident that development of up-to-date research facilities—some of which could be identified as large, regional, or national resources—was lagging behind. To get some measure of just where we stand, we need to look back more than 10 years when the so-called Public Health Service omnibus bill was enacted. That legislation through a key action (433a) provided the statutory authority for the Public Health Service to make grants for the construction of medical research facilities essential for the carrying out of research in the several categorical disease areas. Under this authority a small number of grants were made for the construction of cancer and heart research facilities, but the Korean war, among other factors, brought this program to a halt. From that time until 1956, a hiatus—in retrospect, a very serious hiatus—occurred.

In 1956, the Congress added title VII to the Public Health Service Act, authorizing up to \$30 million each year for 3

years to assist in the construction and equipping of research facilities to enlarge the general capacity of medical schools, universities, and other institutions for research in the sciences related to health. These general needs have been so urgent that in 1958 the Congress extended the authority for an additional 3 years—through fiscal year 1962.

MATCHING PROGRAMS SUCCESSFUL BUT LIMITED

Let me sketch briefly some of the accomplishments that have been achieved through this modest effort alone. Since this program was announced in the fall of 1956, over \$321 million in Federal funds have been requested by eligible applicants. These requests have been thoroughly documented in more than 1,100 applications from institutions doing health-related research—by public and private nonprofit schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health; and by hospitals, universities, and other research institutions. From the \$150 million appropriated for the first 5 program years, 755 grants have been awarded to 320 institutions in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. According to the latest report we have received, 265 of these projects have been completed and over 180 projects are under contract—many of which are nearing completion.

With the kind of progress we have experienced in the construction of research facilities in the past 3 years, one might ask: "Is this enough? Does not this not satisfy the need?" The answer, our committee has found, is positively "No" on three counts. First, the funds authorized for this program are inadequate to meet any but a small portion of the need that exists. Secondly, the limitations of our matching program simply are too restrictive to allow many institutions to help fill national research needs perceived by our committee because of the inability of those institutions to finance construction to carry out research for which they are otherwise well qualified. Thirdly, since the program was directed to the general research needs of institutions it has failed to provide support for construction of facilities directly aimed at the highly complex and specialized needs of research in two specific major disease problems.

Now on the first point—that is, the inadequacy of the appropriation authorization, we noted in the statement in support of this year's appropriation request that there are projects awaiting action, despite the fact that the full appropriation has been used every year for the past 5 years. Let me give you the picture: As of March 10, 1961, there was a backlog of \$22 million worth of projects that had been approved by the National Health Research Facilities Advisory Council but were awaiting payment. An additional 126 applications of over \$48 million were pending, which represented new or deferred applications that were awaiting action of the Council. And an additional 93 notices of intent to file applications valued at over \$33 million were on file. After persistent inquiry, our committee persuaded the expert witness on this subject to give us his best realistic estimate of the amount that

could be used each year. That estimate was \$65 million a year—over twice our present limitation and \$15 million a year more than authorization provided in the amendment of this legislation submitted to the Congress by the administration.

NONMATCHING PROGRAM FILLS SPECIFIC NEED

Now I would like to turn to the other points having to do with the availability of support for the construction of categorical research facilities on a nonmatching basis. In the course of the committee's hearings last year, we requested and were provided with data obtained from NIH, its advisers, and others that clearly demonstrated the need for cancer research facilities. We were told that those needs were not otherwise typical of organizations doing research, since their programs focused on the cancer problem exclusively in contrast to most university research programs, which usually encompass a variety of research fields. The data, accumulated from 10 cancer research institutes, indicated an immediate need for over \$28 million in research laboratory space. In addition, I made a special effort to bring out some of the facts about the statutory authority of such grants. It was generally acknowledged that purely categorical cancer research facilities represented a true national need. As a result, our committee recommended, and the Congress provided, a special earmark appropriation of \$5 million to the National Cancer Institute for the support of construction of cancer research facilities. This was not offered as a 1-year effort; it was a start upon which could be mounted a national program for cancer construction needs and one which might be extended to other categorical areas as needs were demonstrated and as programs were described and presented. Yet considerable misinformation about this program has persisted, and, in fact, the administration itself early in this session offered—as part of its recommended legislation—a proposal to repeal the authority for making nonmatching construction grants.

The Kennedy administration in recommending the repeal of the authority by which cancer research facilities are being built on a nonmatching basis completely disregards the most pressing need in the area of cancer research which exists in our Nation this year. This need was emphasized time and again during the many days of hearings held before our subcommittee. Dr. Kenneth Endicott, Director of the National Cancer Institute, testified before our committee as follows in testimony taken from part 2 of our hearings, page 871:

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS FOR CANCER RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. LAIRD. In the area of cancer research facilities, limited to this categorical area, you have before you at the present time, I understand, a group of applications for medical research facilities. One of the requirements of these applications was the certification that all avenues had been investigated and that the facility which was proposed could not possibly be constructed if they were required to meet the standards of the Medical Research Facility Act. What do these applications total in dollars and cents?

Dr. ENDICOTT. We have before us for consideration at the next meeting of the council some 30 applications for \$25,819,165.

Mr. LAIRD. And there is a certification with these applications that the research facilities could not be constructed under any other program?

Dr. ENDICOTT. We have asked them to demonstrate that they have exhausted every reasonable possibility of raising matching funds. Now, of course, all of these applicants will be visited before their grants are acted upon. The visiting teams are now in the field. The council meeting will be at the end of April, the 29th and 30th of April and 1st of May.

I had an opportunity to talk to the site visitors, who have visited perhaps half by now, and the report was made at the Council meeting a week or so ago, 2 weeks ago I guess it was, that none of the applicants visited at that time could be excluded from eligibility on this basis. In other words, so far as the visitors could tell, they had, in fact, exhausted every reasonable possibility of raising matching funds.

Mr. LAIRD. You have \$5 worth of applications for every \$1 that you have available to you for this program.

Dr. ENDICOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you know of any other program in the National Cancer Institute where there is such a great demand for funds, in any ratio like that?

Dr. ENDICOTT. Not this year, sir.

Against this historical backdrop, let us examine the most recent developments. First, and most importantly, what has happened as a result of the conservative start afforded by the \$5 million cancer construction program authorized for the current year? Although there has been relatively little positive publicity on the program, universities, medical schools, hospitals, and other research institutions have responded with well thought out programs in the cancer research field. In fact, I understand that the National Advisory Cancer Council, which met just last month, considered over 30 applications from nearly as many institutions for grants totaling over \$25 million. This set of facts alone indicate that our earlier judgments not only were correct for the current year but will probably hold, at least in principle, for the foreseeable future.

For the second most recent development in this effort to examine all the pertinent facts on health research construction, we need only turn to the record of the committee's hearings, released earlier this month. During the questioning of the administration witnesses, I asked for an estimate of what the greatest needs would be in medical research in the next 3 years. Three factors were cited, and the first of the three was research facilities. To make sure that there would be no misunderstanding, I asked which one of the three factors mentioned should have the highest priority; and the unhesitating answer was, and I quote, "Most acutely, research facilities." Later, in response to a specific question as to what might happen if the research construction were limited to a 50-50 matching program only, the committee was told, if the present bill (to repeal) is enacted as such, I think there is going to be a serious deficiency because I think that many schools cannot develop the research plans they desire on a 50-50 basis.

FACILITIES ESSENTIAL TO PROGRESS

These are the facts, then, that make our course clear; if medical research is to continue to flower, we must take the necessary steps to see that the construction of facilities—not only general purpose facilities—but the specialized facilities for research in categorical diseases, keeps pace with the other component factors of sound medical research—growth for the Nation. I am thinking specifically of the urgent need to provide research space for the numbers of bright young people emerging from our training programs—young people with creative minds and full measures of research ideas of high potential. I am thinking of the rapidly evolving research techniques and instrumentation for cancer research and cardiovascular research that are crying for up-to-date facilities in which to be put to work for the benefit of mankind. The steps we must take, as the facts I have just related indicate, are:

First, we must not only continue the health research facilities construction program, we must substantially increase its annual limitation in the years ahead, and

Second, we must not only continue the present nonmatching program for construction of research facilities to meet national and regional needs in the categorical area of cancer, but we must also expand this program to other categorical areas as opportunities and meaningful programs are developed and presented.

INCREASES FOR ALL RESEARCH APPROPRIATIONS SUPPORTED

Now I would like to turn to the general considerations surrounding my support for the appropriations for the Public Health Service's medical research activities. I am sure that there is general agreement on the consistent bipartisan nature of the support in Congress for these programs which seek to acquire new knowledge in order that people may have better health. I cannot recall that there has ever been a time when the action of a committee members or of the committee itself has been governed by considerations related to the party in power. There have been years, however, when the executive branch has been unduly restrictive in setting the level of its appropriation requests for medical research activities; and this, I am sorry to say, is one of those years.

We have heard much about the New Frontier but apparently it does not yet include the frontier of the medical sciences. The administration is organizing a bold new program to help our fellow man in underdeveloped countries but it is apparently not yet ready to expand a health research program which will benefit men everywhere. It apparently finds nothing odd in planning to spend three times as much to put man into space as it proposed to spend for the research needed to keep men on earth a little longer.

The Members of this Congress should know that the level of \$641 million for the NIH appropriations represents the original estimate for fiscal year 1962 prepared by the Director of NIH, working in conjunction with the directors of the

several institutes. This is the same budget that was supported by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In fact, the new Surgeon General in testifying before our subcommittee supported the \$641 million appropriation with a most positive statement. His testimony makes it very clear that his request of \$101 million above the original \$540 million budget for the National Institutes of Health would be the absolute limit which he could support. No guidelines or limitations were imposed upon him in arriving at this figure. His testimony on page 56 of volume II of our hearings is as follows:

NIH BUDGET FOR 1962

Mr. LAIRD. You are a new Surgeon General and you made a very careful study of the budget of the National Institutes of Health. You had long experience in the National Institutes of Health, and served as the Acting Director of the Heart Institute. You prepared a budget which you submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That provided for an increase in the NIH budget of \$101 million.

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That was your best judgment?

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. As to what the National Institutes of Health could use to carry on an effective program for 1962?

Dr. TERRY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you think that we would be getting to the point where you would have better control over this program if we followed your recommendation this year?

Dr. TERRY. I do not know, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. You did not have any guidelines given to you by President Kennedy, or the Bureau of the Budget, or anyone else, in determining that particular figure?

Dr. TERRY. We had guidelines, but not limitations, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. But there was no limitation imposed upon you, that you could not go above \$101 million?

Dr. TERRY. There was no suggestion that I could, should, or could not.

Mr. LAIRD. And you had complete freedom in the area of funding when you came up with that recommendation?

Dr. TERRY. I had complete freedom in terms of making what I felt was the best recommendation that could be made for the National Institutes of Health.

It is interesting to note that the Bureau of the Budget arbitrarily cut back the \$641 million figure to \$583 million for the National Institutes of Health. This cutback in the requests of the Surgeon General and the Public Health Service represents the New Frontier's position on these vital health research programs.

In past years, the Congress—responding to the wishes of the people it represents—has appropriated those additional funds which medical research could wisely and profitably use. The record gives substantial evidence that these additional funds were, in fact, wisely and profitably used, and that the forward thrust of these programs will not be sustained unless additional funds are provided now. I am therefore wholeheartedly in support of the committee's bill, which is now before you for action, calling for a level of \$641 million for the

eight appropriations of the National Institutes of Health. It is impossible to measure these \$641 million against vital statistics that report on the deaths from cancer, heart disease, diabetes, infections, and a host of other health hazards. We cannot talk of them in terms of death rates or millions of deaths per year. What we are concerned with is people and with supporting a long-range and tireless effort to produce health facts—facts that mean children may be strong instead of crippled; families held together in strength instead of separated by death; and for even the most severely crippled, a productive life instead of long-term disability.

The appropriation figure of \$641 million for NIH for 1962 is a sound one, and I urge each Member to join with me and the members of our committee in supporting this funding level for the coming year.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains an amount of \$64,450,000 for grants to States for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Grants to States will be made on the basis of a \$90 million allotment. This is, without doubt, one of the best investments we make, for this is the program which helps restore disabled people to activity and usefulness and jobs. In addition we have approved an appropriation of \$19,250,000 for research and training. This is an increase of \$2 million above the Kennedy budget.

I have great enthusiasm for the work being done in this program. It has been developing soundly for the past 40 years and I believe it has reached the place where we should support a substantial expansion in this humane and sensible approach to the problems of our disabled men and women.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION LEADERSHIP

For much of the improvement in the vocational rehabilitation program, we are indebted to the previous administration, which proposed the law which was enacted in 1954, and which is now the basis for this entire rehabilitation effort on the part of the Federal Government and the States. I take pride in the fact that, since 1954, the Federal-State program has nearly doubled the number of disabled people rehabilitated each year. In addition, there is an excellent research program, to secure new knowledge and new methods, and a training program to produce the skilled staffs to work with larger numbers of the disabled.

The previous administration consistently requested increased funds for the rehabilitation program and our committee has never failed to report a bill in support of these increases. We have, in fact, recommended additional increases on several occasions, for I am convinced—as the committee has been—that we still are not fully capitalizing on the great potentials of the vocational rehabilitation program.

The previous administration provided a foundation for expanding this program and I should like this to be clear. In fact, during the committee's hearings this spring, the eminent Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Miss

Mary E. Switzer, expressed her gratitude for the great progress made possible by the last administration. She pointed out that the clear commitment made by the last administration, back in 1954, has actually made today's program possible. On this point, I would like to quote Miss Switzer from the record:

I think we cannot say often enough that the commitment of the previous administration to this program in a very special way has made it possible for us to tell the story we are now able to tell. I think it has not only been in the shift in the law and the funds that were provided by the Federal Government to permit the States to move ahead, but in the development of the research and training program and, finally, in the development of the international program. I would certainly like the record to be clear as to my views on that.

I should like also, at this point, to pay my respects to the able and distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. FORGARTY]. The gentleman from Rhode Island has served on the HEW appropriations subcommittee longer than any member of the Senate or the House. He has been a consistent and effective champion of the vocational rehabilitation program. Under his chairmanship, the program receives the same careful scrutiny as all requests coming before the committee, yet he has shown his belief in the basic soundness of the rehabilitation program by his support of the funds required to expand it.

WISCONSIN REHABILITATION PROGRAM

In Wisconsin we have a rehabilitation program which is doing an excellent job and which was for many years a leader among the States in this work. I am hopeful that Wisconsin will soon be able to develop its program to the place where every disabled person in our State will be able to get the rehabilitation services he needs to become self-sustaining again—and I would offer that same hope for the disabled residents of every State, for this is one of the things we mean when we say that the United States is the land of opportunity.

IN 1962 OVER 107,000 TO BE REHABILITATED

Last year the Federal-State rehabilitation program restored 88,000 disabled people to employment. This year they expect to rehabilitate 96,000. The bill before us now will provide enough funds to enable the State agencies to rehabilitate about 107,000 disabled individuals. To me, this is a wonderful thing to do—to provide the means whereby these thousands of handicapped Americans will become able to look after themselves, learn a job, and have the satisfaction of being self-supporting citizens.

I find a special pleasure in the fact that this appropriation will make it possible for the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation to reach another milestone in its history—for if the committee's bill is approved, 1962 will be the first year in which this program has rehabilitated more than 100,000 disabled people in a single year.

Aside from the numbers being rehabilitated, the State rehabilitation agencies today are helping us in many ways in the economic and social problems which confront both the States and the Federal

Government. While the appropriations for this work represent an outlay of Federal funds and of State funds, the rehabilitation programs have shown time and again that the cost of this work is returned to the Federal and State Treasury many times in the form of taxes which the disabled people pay when they return to work.

While our Government is considering many proposals having to do with our older citizens, the rehabilitation program is already doing something constructive about it. As we all know, the proportion of disability increases with age. However, with proper rehabilitation services, many of our older citizens cannot only become active again, but many of them can work at their old jobs or at new ones. The rehabilitation programs in the States have been proving this for several years. Back in 1945 less than 7,500 disabled persons over 45 years old were rehabilitated and restored to employment. That represented about 17 percent of the total for that year. This number has been growing steadily since then, and next year an estimated 33,000 disabled people in this age group, or 31 percent of the total, will be rehabilitated.

The success and the growth of this program—and many other rehabilitation programs outside the Government—are due in part to the excellent programs in training and research conducted by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

TRAINING REHAB WORKERS

We cannot expect to see larger numbers of disabled people restored unless something is done to cope with the shortages of professional personnel who work with the disabled. This need is so serious that it affects both the public program and the many fine voluntary agencies now engaged in this bill for expanding the training grant program aimed at meeting at least a part of this need, so that in the coming years there will be more physicians trained in the special procedures of rehabilitation—more physical therapists and occupational therapists—more rehabilitation counselors to work with the State agencies and others—and an increase in several other types of professional workers who are essential in providing rehabilitation services.

At the same time, the training program will support short, intensive courses of instruction for personnel already working in rehabilitation, to give them specialized training for working with people who have severe and especially difficult handicaps. One of these is mental illness, in which the possibilities for expanding our rehabilitation work are so tremendous. Another is mental retardation, in which the rehabilitation programs are trying to make a major effort. These disabilities require special knowledge which is now being provided to the staffs of the State agencies and other organizations through the training program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION RESEARCH PROGRAM

The research program holds the real key to the future of rehabilitation work. We must have new knowledge, new pro-

cedures, new information if our investments in coming years are to pay the greatest dividends. Already the benefits of such research are beginning to flow into the work of rehabilitation agencies. Advanced types of artificial limbs are being developed, some of them offering simplified mechanical apparatus which reduces pressures on the user and aids his walking. Experimental work now is being done to see if the power impulses generated by certain muscles in the body can be used as control signals to manage artificial limbs. Other research is developing various kinds of external power, such as the hydraulic principle, to see if this type of power can be brought under control to the delicate degree required to safely actuate an artificial arm and hand.

A great variety of other research is being done in several hundred hospitals, universities, rehabilitation centers, and other research institutions of the country. In certain places, projects are under way to develop and increase the research capacities of schools and institutions which already have the nucleus of talent and facilities they need. One of these is in my own State of Wisconsin where the Curative Workshop of Milwaukee and the Marquette University School of Medicine are cooperating to develop a well-rounded plan and program of research in rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION CENTERS

The committee has also heard testimony on a further proposal in research which I believe has great merit. We still have not provided, in the field of rehabilitation, comprehensive research and training institutions where the several kinds of scientists and professional people can jointly work on the complicated problems of severe disability. This concept of the major and complete research and teaching center has been adopted in many other fields—in medicine, in space problems, and other areas—and it can be a powerful step forward in solving many of the problems of disability which remain unanswered today.

I believe we should support the establishment of several such centers and this bill provides the funds to begin with two in 1962. These centers would make available, as part of a total rehabilitation research effort, the skills of physicians, therapists, prosthetics experts, rehabilitation counselors, engineers, physicists, and other scientific personnel who play key roles in developing new knowledge in the total problem of disability and rehabilitation. They also would provide a complete training program for professional students. This sort of center probably will require that the work be carried out in a university, where the personnel and facilities can be provided in one organized effort. We have a number of outstanding universities in this country which already are engaged in teaching, research, and service in rehabilitation, and which would be prepared to undertake this sort of responsibility within a very short time.

In summary, then, I believe this bill provides essential funds for the further development of one of our most impor-

tant public programs—vocational rehabilitation. I believe these funds for the rehabilitation of our disabled citizens represent one of the finest investments we make. I urge your support of this appropriation.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that hospital rates have gone up over 300 percent over the last two decades. This increase will continue unless, through research, hospital design and operations can be improved.

This bill which we bring before the House of Representatives today provides for a new program to study hospital costs through the construction of two hospital research facilities. This program is undertaken under the authority of section 433A of the Public Health Service Act. Our committee feels that there will be sufficient benefit to any community in which such a research facility is located; that there should be a minimum of one-third non-Federal matching funds contributed by the community involved.

Our committee is very proud of starting this new program and wishes to give proper credit to outstanding doctors from the Mayo Clinic and Rochester Methodist Hospital who appeared before our committee suggesting that we embark on a hospital research facility program. I particularly wish to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, from Minnesota's First Congressional District, Mr. QUIE, who has worked very closely with our committee in the development of this new program.

The bill before us today includes \$10 million to carry on this research program in hospital facilities and costs.

Since 1955, personnel of the Rochester Methodist Hospital, members of its board of directors, and members of the staff of Mayo Clinic have studied intensively several aspects of hospital function and design, in preparation for new hospital facilities. These studies have had as their objective new approaches to hospital construction and operation, to more efficient utilization of personnel, to improved care of the patient and to reduction of hospitalization costs. The studies to date include construction of, and controlled experiments with, a circular 12-bed nursing unit for the care of the critically ill.

Further studies are needed to reach the goals of improved care and reduced costs. The Rochester Methodist Hospital is seeking financial assistance for construction of an experimental and demonstrative hospital for research in patient care, hospital function, and design.

Surprisingly little controlled research is recorded in medical literature on the effect of physical facilities on care of the patient or on how design can reduce hospitalization costs. The lack of research in this field contrasts sharply with the tremendous amounts of money and energy expended for research in medicine and industry. And this dearth of critical studies is particularly surprising when one realizes that the operation of hospitals is said to be the third largest industry in the United

States. Billions of dollars have been spent for hospital construction in this country alone in recent years.

A further indication of the need for careful reappraisal of hospital design and operation is the continuous increase in the cost of hospital care since 1940. Statistics from the U.S. Department of Labor demonstrate increases of almost 300 percent in the rates charged by hospitals in this period. This is much greater than the increase in consumer prices and the increase in physicians' fees over the same period.

A survey was made in Rochester in 1955 to determine variations in care required by patients in St. Marys Hospital and Rochester Methodist Hospital. This survey included classification by Mayo Clinic physicians of 1,100 patients for 7,513 patient-days according to the type of care required by each patient. Each day for a week each patient was placed in one of three categories based on the amount of nursing care required:

Stage 1: Constant observation because of serious illness.

Stage 2: Average care.

Stage 3: Minimal care because of satisfactory progress or a nonserious type of illness.

Analysis of this data revealed that on any given day approximately 20 percent of patients required stage-1 care, 60-percent stage-2 care, and 20-percent stage-3 care. While these percentages will vary somewhat from one hospital to another, the study did quantitate what has been recognized as a fact: Not every patient in a given hospital requires the same amount of care. Patients in stage 1 need more hours of nursing care daily and the care of more skilled personnel than patients in stage 2 or stage 3. Conversely, patients in stage 3 need fewer hours of nursing care daily and care of less skilled personnel than patients in stage 1 or stage 2. In addition, patients in the convalescent or stage-3 category appeared not to require the extensive equipment and facilities that are necessary for care of seriously ill patients.

The initial studies were directed toward the seriously ill patient who requires constant observation and more than average care, since it is this patient that incurs the greatest hospital expense. After consideration of many different possible architectural designs, it was the consensus that this category of patients could be cared for best in a small nursing unit of circular design with the nurses' station centrally located and the patients' rooms placed peripherally. The inner wall of each room was to be made of double doors containing clear glass panels. This design would make each of the 12 patients visible to the nurse from her centrally located work station and the patients could at all times see the nurse. It would also reduce the distance between the patient and the nurse at her desk.

Funds were collected to build such an experimental unit from private foundations and from the Methodist Hospital. A research committee of Mayo Clinic physicians was appointed to supervise controlled research in an effort to determine the effect of hospital design and function on patient care.

Time does not permit review of the considerable mass of information accumulated from these studies of patient care in the circular unit and in the rectangular unit. Detailed data was accumulated and has been published.¹

Among the many factors studied, several stand out. It was shown that the patient was better satisfied with his care in the circular unit, as were the patient's relatives because of the reassurance provided by constant visual contact between the patients and the nurses. Corridor travel by nurses was significantly less. Most surprising was the cost. A patient in a conventional unit requiring three special duty nurses around the clock pays \$54 a day plus a room charge on an average of \$20 or a total of \$74. In the circular unit, equal or superior care was given for a total of \$36 per day—a savings of \$38 per day.

The experimental team has completed controlled studies of the care required by the patient who is acutely ill and evaluated how this is affected by architectural design. It has, however, only scratched the surface. What will be the effect of design and different methods of operation on the other 80 percent of the population in the hospital? Some hospitals have considered various phases of progressive patient care, but to date there has been no critical evaluation of the quality of care or its cost. This should be done before the method is more widely copied. Under ideal and controlled conditions is progressive patient care of a higher quality and lower in cost?

PROPOSED FUTURE HOSPITAL RESEARCH

Those responsible for studies to date have begun development of a program of study for the future when the experimental hospital is available. The research to be carried out in such a hospital would include:

First. Comparison of the circular nursing units with rectangular units in care of stage 2 and stage 3 patients to determine whether the circular design is superior for these groups. Both the quality of such care and the cost per patient-day would be evaluated.

Second. Positive determination of the feasibility of progressive patient care of patients in a general hospital. Again both the quality of the care received by the patients and the cost of that care would be ascertained.

Third. Study of other proposed schemes for segregation of patients by clinical service or probable length of stay. Possibly patients admitted for 1 to 3 days for a special diagnostic or therapeutic procedure could be accommodated at lower cost in a special hospital unit.

Fourth. Consideration of all possible mechanical, electric, and pneumatic devices to reduce hospital labor costs and installation of such devices for actual trial if determined to be of practical value.

¹ Sturdevant, Madelyne: Comparisons of Intensive Nursing Service in a Circular and a Rectangular Unit: American Hospital Association, 1960.

SUMMARY

Considerable effort has been devoted to the Rochester Methodist Hospital study project by those bearing the local responsibility, and only after such effort had been made was it felt proper to seek help elsewhere. A great deal of data has been collected, study methods have been developed, and appraisal techniques have been refined, but much work remains to be done before the full significance and potential of the concepts under study can be precisely delineated.

In order to evaluate completely the patient care, costs, and patient-relative acceptance of stage care, an experimental hospital with its design based on function is necessary. This will be a tool for future studies. If approached with boldness and imagination, one can visualize that critical research might produce contributions in hospital design and patient care that could be prototypes throughout the country for many decades to come.

With the increasing and aging population, with the obvious immediate need for more hospital beds, with inadequate numbers of trained nurses available, and with the ever-increasing costs of hospitalization, it seems reasonable that any effort to solve these problems is a worthwhile contribution to the Nation's health and welfare.

The gentleman from Rhode Island has served on this committee longer than any Member of either the House or the Senate, and has gone through this bill on an item-by-item basis during the last 45 minutes.

This bill is not an easy one for the Members of the House Committee on Appropriations to labor with each year. There is more testimony taken on the record than before any other subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been growing. In each of the last 9 years there have been substantial increases in the bill. This is particularly true when we look at the National Institutes of Health and the budget submission of the National Institutes of Health over the last 9 or 10 years. We have found ourselves in a position here in the House of Representatives where we have had additions made in the National Institutes of Health budget well beyond the appropriation level which has been established by our House committee during each of the last 7 years.

It was my hope that this year we would find ourselves in a position where the executive branch of our Government would take over the leadership of this particular program, and where the new Surgeon General would be in a position of giving strong leadership to the medical research program conducted by the National Institutes of Health.

I was indeed disappointed that this did not take place. We find that the recommendation made by the Surgeon General, after a considerable amount of study, meant very little to the New Frontier. These recommendations were made by a man who had served as acting head of the Heart Institute, who had long experience with the National

Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service, but were not given much consideration by the New Frontier. It seems to me that it is most important that the executive branch under the leadership of the Surgeon General take control and give leadership to the whole area of medical research.

For that reason our subcommittee has included in this bill for the first time the recommendation of the Surgeon General as far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned. In the past the figures which have been recommended by the Surgeon General have been increased from \$100 million to as high as \$200 million by the other body. This year we are basing our committee recommendations on sound testimony, study, and research which has been done by the new Surgeon General as well as our committee. It may be necessary for us to bring this bill back to the House of Representatives at some future time in order to substantiate the \$64 million figure, anticipating that the Senate might take action to increase this bill. The House of Representatives I am sure will stand firm on the recommendations of this subcommittee, and I believe that such a vote at a future time is probably inevitable.

In this particular bill we are placing special emphasis upon several programs. First, we are placing greater emphasis in the area of training the unskilled worker and the semiskilled worker and in also training people who are taken off the labor market by various handicaps. It seems to me that when we considered the depressed areas legislation passed early in this session of the Congress, a bill with over 95 percent of authorized funds in direct subsidies to industry, with less than 5 percent of the authorization going to this area of training individuals. It is sad but true that we enacted a piece of legislation which did not clearly meet the problems as we face the challenge of the 1960's.

During our committee hearings the new Secretary of Labor, and last year Secretary of Labor Mitchell, pointed out to us that the need in the labor market, as we face the next 5- and 10-year period is in the area of the semiskilled and the skilled worker. It seems that the emphasis which we give in this bill to training individual Americans is a much greater step forward than the legislation which passed the House giving 95 percent of the aid in the form of direct subsidies to industry. I believe that the increased emphasis which we give to vocational training and vocational rehabilitation, the emphasis which we are giving to the apprenticeship training program, will go a long way in facing up to the problems of employment in the sixties.

has to but pick up the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times or any of the other large metropolitan papers in the United States today and find on each Sunday new records being made in the want-ad sections of those papers, showing job opportunities for semiskilled and skilled workers. This type of training approach will go much farther than the depressed-area type of approach which

places the emphasis on subsidies to industry instead of helping individuals secure job opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that was arrived at through hard work on the part of our subcommittee, and by the full committee and it was in a spirit of compromise that several of the sections are brought before us today. I do believe that the emphasis which we are giving to the program in this next year, the increased emphasis we have given to training individuals, to educational co-operative research, as compared with the budget presented to us, represents sound progress.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the reduction of \$1 million in the amount for national defense fellowships; if he could explain why that was done.

Mr. LAIRD. The budget estimate was for \$22,762,000. We reduced this to \$21,762,000. I think it is important to realize that this represents an increase over last year's program of a little over \$1 million.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That is right.

Mr. LAIRD. We feel that the fellowships which have been approved by the Office of Education should be very carefully scrutinized. I direct the attention of the gentleman to the record of the hearings of our committee, in which all of these fellowships as they were approved by the Office of Education are set forth. We feel that some of the fellowships approved are not in keeping with the intent of the National Defense Education Act as it was explained, as it was presented, and as it was passed by the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. We feel that this needs review. Certainly an increase of \$1 million over last year's budget allows sufficient latitude for the Office of Education to carry on a very fine program, but we want to give them a warning, we want these programs and grants reviewed very carefully.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman feels that there is sufficient money in the bill to carry forward the proper program which was properly laid out in the law? You feel some abuses may have come into it, and that is why you have cut it back? Is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is basically correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. We are almost up to the full authorization for this. The full authorization happens to be \$22,762,000. We are only \$1 million below the authorization. I believe this is healthy for the program.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on what he said about retraining. I think his analysis was excellent. Does the gentleman

feel the amount in the bill is adequate for these purposes?

Mr. LAIRD. I feel that the amount contained in this bill is a great improvement over what the administration asked for as far as these activities are concerned. Whether the administration will expend the funds at the rate that we have established I cannot say. I am hopeful these funds will be released by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HECHLER. I share the gentleman's enthusiasm for retraining as a means of picking up the economy in those areas affected by automation. I think it is a direct method. I think it gives full attention to the human problem. I hope that additional steps forward will be made in this very vital area of retraining.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that this business of international research grants has grown so big they have had to set up a staff officer to take care of it?

Mr. LAIRD. The international research grants as far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes. The total amount of funds made available, using soft currencies wherever we can in this particular area, has grown in the last few years.

An Office of International Research has been established at the National Institutes of Health to coordinate and exercise control over the development of these programs. Dr. Martin Cummings, who is now chairman of the department of microbiology at the University of Oklahoma Medical School, has been appointed Chief of this Office. It is my understanding that Dr. Cummings is an outstanding investigator with a broad background in medical research and its international ramifications.

Mr. GROSS. This is a brandnew Office, is that correct, or comparatively new?

Mr. LAIRD. It is a unit within the Office of the Director of the National Institutes of Health. It will have the function and responsibility for administering these overseas research activities.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee go into some of these research grants? I called attention to one or two of them last year. Did they go into it this year?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, we did. I think the gentleman referred last year, when this bill was on the floor, to some of these grants. We made a rather thorough study of them this year.

I will be very glad to furnish the gentleman a list of those grants.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I commend the gentleman and the chairman of the subcommittee and all its other members for this bill as a whole and especially for two particular items which I think are of

great significance. One is the provision of funds to establish two regional institutes of vocational rehabilitation. At one time I had prepared a bill to establish in the National Institutes of Health an additional institute on vocational rehabilitation. This is a field that has been too long neglected, and it is a field that pays special dividends in that it returns disabled people to useful work. Thousands of persons who are in some way or other disabled are converted from tax consumers to self-supporting, self-respecting taxpayers.

But as I considered it further, it seemed wiser to follow the course this bill adopts of aiding and developing existing institutes, because research in rehabilitation is not so much a matter of laboratory research or test tube studies as it is a matter of working directly with patients. This research and training can best be done where the patients are in various places throughout the country rather than in Bethesda. So your committee, in its wisdom, very properly has recommended on a sort of trial basis, appropriation of \$500,000 to each of two established institutions, each already cooperating with a high-grade university that is doing work in the same field. I am sure this is a pattern of Federal assistance which, at least in this special field, can be very productive, and I commend the subcommittee for its leadership and foresight.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I have talked with my colleague on several occasions about the need for this type of center approach. We feel that the two centers which are provided for in this bill will be a real help. They will not only help to take care of individuals who happen to have an opportunity to use these centers, but I think even more important functions will be served by them in that they will provide a complete training program for professional students in vocational rehabilitation and will demonstrate procedures that others may follow in improving vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the Nation.

I would like to say we are making good and great progress in the field of vocational rehabilitation and this bill not only provides for the starting of these two additional centers, but it will make it possible to rehabilitate 107,000 individuals next year. This is real progress.

I would like, too, to point to the fact that it was President Eisenhower who sent a special message to the Congress on vocational rehabilitation, and since that message came to the Congress, I think there has been an entirely different emphasis on this program. We have gone from rehabilitating about 60,000 people each year, to over 100,000 people. This is a very fine program and it is done on a cooperative basis with the States. It is a matching program, with the States and the local communities really being responsible for its operation, under some guidance and these matching funds from the Federal Government.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding further. The other pioneering step I would like to commend is the

provision of \$10 million for hospital construction following out the pattern that very careful research and study at the Mayo Clinic have demonstrated can be so effective in giving better medical care to acutely ill patients who need 24-hour nursing care. Furthermore, it provides the better care at greatly reduced costs and with enormous benefit to the state of mind of the patients. A seriously ill and anxious patient who is down at the end of a long hall and may be afraid that when he wants help, the nurse may not be able to come, often pushes the button unnecessarily just to see the nurse and be reassured. In contrast, in this circular arrangement which was worked out at Rochester, and which I have had an opportunity to examine, there is a large picture window from the room to the center where the nurses are. The patient can see the nurses at all times and the nurses can see the patient. A curtain can be drawn when relatives are visiting or when treatments are being given, so that the patient is given the necessary privacy when needed. It makes the patients feel better, more secure, if they can look out and see the nurse and know she is available. This new pattern offers great possibilities, both from the standpoint of the well-being of patients and from the standpoint of the costs of hospital care to all who have to pay them. Again, I comment the gentleman and his committee for this important breakthrough.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman from Wisconsin answered some questions concerning a portion of the committee report on the extension of teaching and education of the mentally retarded. As I understand the appropriation made in this bill is \$1 million, the amount of the budget request, and is the same as it was for fiscal year 1961. The committee in its report, however, had recommended the broadening of the authorizing legislation to cover the area of increased responsibility, especially for teachers of the mentally retarded and for teaching children with speech and hearing defects. Will the gentleman tell us what the committee had in mind when it made this recommendation?

Mr. LAIRD. It would be necessary for the authorization to be amended, and legislation is now pending which raises this particular authorization.

Mrs. MAY. I think this is highly to be desired. I have a very particular interest in this field. One more question, if the gentleman will permit. On that same page of the report the committee states that it feels that the activity of the service for mental retardation under the Office of Education is of such importance that they have made another recommendation that consideration should be given to designating an Assistant to the Commissioner to be in charge of that phase of the activity, other exceptional children, and children with speech and hearing defects. Would the gentleman enlarge on that specifi-

cally and tell us what action may be taken in this important field?

Mr. LAIRD. This action can be taken by the Commissioner to designate an individual who would be in charge of this program. We feel that by concentrating responsibility in one person who would devote his entire time to this program and acquiring a thorough understanding of what is taking place throughout each of the 50 States, that it would be of great help in furthering the programs of help to this group of children.

Mrs. MAY. I commend the gentleman for his attention to this subject. The State of Washington has done some rather outstanding work but we need additional assistance in this field. I feel this is deserving of the support of all.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Washington for her helpful suggestions.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. GARLAND. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin tell me where these two vocational rehabilitation institutes will be located?

Mr. LAIRD. The location of those institutions is not established by our committee. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Maine to the wording of our report, page 12, where is set forth the basis under which the assignment will be made.

Mr. GARLAND. That will be left to the Department to determine where they will go?

Mr. LAIRD. That will be left to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and their advisory committee.

Mr. GARLAND. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman explain to me, on page 5, in the "Grants for construction of cancer research facilities," that \$5 million is not, am I correct in my understanding, subject to the 50-percent matching fund?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. That is made available under section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act, which does not require matching. There is no matching requirement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I wonder the gentleman will explain why I can the expenditure of \$58 million at NIH than the Budget Bureau require.

Mr. LAIRD. In my statement I tried to explain the reason I supported the work done by the National Institutes of Health, why I felt this is a reasonable budget. It is not as much as some members of our committee advocated, as the

gentleman from Rhode Island pointed out, but I believe that we in the Congress are operating on a sound basis by accepting these figures which were justified in the budget submission of the Surgeon General as the best figure, the best funding level for fiscal year 1962 that he could arrive at after long and deliberate study on his part.

We had public witnesses who came before us. If you take the budgets of the individual Directors, you will find those budgets will total about \$100 million more, and the public witnesses \$200 or \$300 million more. I believe we are on a sound footing by accepting the Surgeon General's figure.

I want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the hearing record in which Dr. Terry testified at some length as to the proper funding level.

If you will turn to page 56, part II, you will find a discussion there between Dr. Terry and me in which this figure is substantiated very well, I believe.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Government Operations Committee had a study made, and they found considerable inefficiency in the administration of some of these research projects.

Mr. LAIRD. From the press release I read, I felt there would be a lot of criticism in the report of the Government Operations Committee. I went over the report and I did not find the report very critical. There were statements made in the report that referred to the review of grants, and that they felt there should be better review, and a few other rather mild criticisms.

This program has grown at a rapid rate. That is why I support this funding level. I am not going to support the funding level requested by the public witnesses or the estimates by the Institute Directors of what could be spent. I think this is a reasonable funding level, one under which this program can make proper growth and proper progress in 1962.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. These findings were taken into consideration in setting this figure; is that right?

Mr. LAIRD. Before this bill was marked up I took that report home and spent a considerable amount of time on it, during the weekend before this bill was marked up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] but I would compliment him for his consistent record. I think he has been very, very liberal with the taxpayers' money in this bill, as he has been in the past.

I was impressed by his answer to a question by the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. He said, "Yes, we gave them everything they asked for,"

and I think that runs the full course of this bill, with only a few items, perhaps, shaved a little. Throughout the hearings—I have done my best to read them, and they are voluminous, I will say to the gentleman—I find the gentleman asking many of those who appeared before the committee if they could not use a little more money. "Have you got enough money? Can you not use just a little bit more?" or "quite a little bit more?" So, I want to compliment the gentleman for being real liberal.

Now, I obtained recently a copy of the report of the Committee on Government Operations, the Intergovernmental Subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN]. It is a report on a study of the National Institutes of Health, in which it was found, among other things, that funds were being mishandled. There is a good deal of criticism to be found in this report. I wonder if the gentleman from Rhode Island has seen it?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, I have seen it and I have read it.

Mr. GROSS. And the 13 recommendations were made by the subcommittee?

Mr. FOGARTY. Some of the recommendations have already been carried out, and others are being worked on. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations had a similar investigation made 2 years ago, and there are some discrepancies between the two reports. We plan to have both reports examined this coming year to see where the discrepancies are, because the Committee on Appropriations investigators did not agree with some of the findings of this committee you speak of. But, we think it is a good idea for the other committee to make these investigations, and if they come up with some good suggestions, they will be followed.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to hear that the gentleman is going into the report. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any kind of a guess as to the number of new employees that will be put on the payroll as the result of this appropriation bill we have before us today. It seems to me, in going through the hearings, that a lot of new employees will be put on the payroll.

Mr. FOGARTY. There will be about 400 in the Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. 400?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. And approximately 3,000 in HEW.

Mr. GROSS. 3,000. That would be 3,400 additional employees to be put on the payroll.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is in round figures.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Well, that is a lot of people.

Mr. FOGARTY. Most of these are in the Public Health Service.

Mr. GROSS. That leads me to a little discussion of some of the things we had up last year. Is the Public Health Service still making grants for the training of dogs?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether they are or not; but, if they are, there is some good reason behind it.

Mr. GROSS. And a study of bird sounds at Cornell University?

Mr. FOGARTY. And the love life of a goat, which turned out to be pretty good research.

Mr. GROSS. Now, in what way could that be good research?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, I would have to refer to the hearings. That was a project that was ridiculed 10 or 11 years ago. But, when we got the facts about it, it turned out to have been a good project and resulted in new information of value. I remember that even one of the writers who ridiculed it admitted afterward that it was a worthwhile project. Some of these things that were criticized severely years ago have turned out to be good projects, although, from their titles, they might sound very foolish to some of us.

Mr. GROSS. For the edification of the new Members, I want to describe the research grant to the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research in Jerusalem, Israel. The grant is for \$33,100. It is described as "A test of the husband-wife relationship."

It is further described as follows:

The aim is to develop a diagnostic pictorial test of both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of the role relationship of husband and wife. The test should be sensitive to the perceptions of actual behavior and norms and to the consonance perceived between these.

I want to ask, as I did last year, whether this grant has expired. Has there been any report made, if the gentleman knows; and if so, what was the result of this study of the intrapersonal and interpersonal relationship of the husband and wife?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether the report has been completed or not.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. We will see that the gentleman gets a copy of this report as soon as it is filed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman; I should like to have it. For the edification of the new Members on both sides of the aisle, there has been some \$89,000 spent by the Public Health Service, and part of it has gone for a study of behavior at cocktail parties. For their edification, I shall read briefly from a preliminary report. It says—

That the room in which the bar is situated tends to become crowded; that there is a variety of guests who will cringe in corners, while others sing, dance, slop martinis into the piano, and pursue members of the opposite sex to the pantry or beyond.

Then it goes on to say:

As the party began, the living room filled with friends; they conversed quietly in small groups of the same sex. Soon the unmarried guests began to scan the knots of people of the opposite sex and then to maneuver. Cross-sex conversations developed.

Things seemed to be off to a fair enough start, and around the bar in the dining room

they stayed lively enough, but in the living room there was an ominous lag: "There was a long period of desultory conversation." Just as a social crisis appeared imminent, the gaiety of the dining-room set began to engulf the others. Things were jumping so much that in the living room dyads of friends came together simply to rest.

Gradually the guests went home; or went to sleep. One hostess at 5 a.m. was unable to find a vacant bed.

I should like to know if we are continuing to spend money for this sort of thing.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman, if he can shed some light on this.

Mr. LAIRD. The Saturday Evening Post had an editorial on this, and I directed an inquiry to the Director of the National Institutes of Health about it.

Mr. GROSS. This is in the Public Health Service, not the National Institutes of Health. Is the gentleman telling me that the National Institutes of Health is engaged in something similar to this?

Mr. LAIRD. I believe this was funded by the National Institutes of Health. This particular project had to do with work of the National Mental Health Institute. Although this project was approved by the study group, and approved by the advisory council and went all the way through the usual procedures for proper approval; I, frankly, do not believe it should have been approved. On the other hand, I don't think we should be too critical if there are three or four bad decisions made out of the thousands of applications that are considered each year.

Mr. GROSS. I have made a request for the complete report by the Public Health Service on "Behavior at Cocktails Parties." I have not been very successful in getting it; in fact, I have not gotten anything except these excerpts from a preliminary report. As the gentleman from Wisconsin is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, would he be good enough to help me try to get a copy of the full report?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I will be very happy to see that the gentleman gets a copy of the report on this particular study. Support for the subject the gentleman is discussing now has been discontinued. It is not being funded at the present time. But I will be glad to see that a report on the information gathered up until the time it was stopped is made available to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not like to deal in excerpts from material, I like to have the full report.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not sure how complete the report will be, because that project was discontinued, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say, in conclusion, that I think an awful lot of money could be saved if the expenditure of these funds was properly screened. I cannot vote for this appropriation bill, dealing as it does in more than \$4.3 billion, until the waste and extravagance is eliminated. I am convinced that many millions

of dollars could be saved without hampering in the least essential research and health services.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, included in the report from the Appropriations Committee is a recommendation for the expenditure of \$10 million for the construction of research hospital facilities. I rise in support of this recommendation, not merely because the experimental work on this proposal was conducted in my congressional district at the Rochester Minnesota Methodist Hospital. But, more importantly, because the results of their work which started 6 years ago could have a dramatic and profoundly important consequence for all Americans.

First, I will discuss the specific problems which the Rochester Methodist Hospital confronted. Then, I will explain the scope of the problem as it concerns our country as a whole. Finally, I will discuss the results of the experimental work already completed, discuss what remains to be done and why this program should receive the support of Federal financing.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is a member here in this House who has not personally been a patient in a hospital or has not had a member of his family as a patient in a hospital. This experience is also generally true of our citizens as a whole. Therefore, all of us have some general knowledge of the tremendous rise in the costs of hospitalization.

To be more specific, the costs of hospitalization have risen—according to the Department of Labor statistics—more than 300 percent in the past 20 years. In a study conducted by doctors at the Mayo Clinic, in Rochester, Minn., it was found that of the total hospital charges to a patient, about 65 percent of these charges were the result of personnel costs and of this 65 percent about one-half was the cost of nursing personnel.

As a first consideration, the doctors at the Mayo Clinic and at the Rochester Methodist Hospital thought it best—back in 1955—to find out just what kind of patients the average hospital in this country took care of. Through a scientific sampling method, they sampled two hospitals in Rochester, Minn. One was the Rochester Methodist Hospital, which has 500 beds, and the other was St. Mary's Hospital, which has 900 beds and is the largest private hospital in our country.

Mayo Clinic doctors and administrators found that on any given day, about 20 percent of the total hospital population was made up of those people who needed intensive nursing care; about 60 percent was made up of those who needed average nursing care and the other 20 percent needed less than average nursing care.

Therefore, it became obvious to these doctors and administrators that the patients they should concentrate on

were the patients costing the most, that is, the 20 percent needing the intensive nursing care.

Their problem then was to attempt to cut the costs of intensive-care patients, and they decided to do this by constructing a radically new type of hospital which they hoped would enable a highly efficient level of nursing care to be maintained at a drastic reduction in costs.

You can easily visualize the type of design they decided on when I tell you it was a circular design something like if you cut an orange in the center. At the core would be the nursing station, and in the various compartments would be the rooms. This enabled the patients to have direct eye contact with the nurses at all times, and also cut down the walking distances of the nurses—giving them more time with the patients themselves.

After this 3-year study, they also found that the drastic reduction in the cost of nursing care which they were hoping to accomplish was actually realized. To bring these results into concrete figures, an intensive-care patient in Rochester—and these costs are similar in most parts of our country—would pay \$54 a day for 24 hours of nursing care. In this experimental unit, the same nursing care was obtained at a cost of \$13.88 a day.

Mr. Chairman, I think these results are of vital importance to our whole country. If the 20 percent of intensive-care patients in our hospitals today could all be taken care of with such efficiency and with such savings, untold millions of dollars could be saved.

In addition, I need but mention the salvaging of many families' savings which all too often are completely wiped up by prolonged hospitalization at the present high costs.

Now, I have discussed the problems which the doctors and administrators of the Rochester Methodist Hospital tried to solve, and the results of their experiment with the 20 percent of intensive-care patients.

I believe the results speak for themselves, but there is much more work to be done. As the doctors and administrators themselves point out, they have satisfactorily proven out only the beneficial effects of this new design on intensive-care patients. Now, they want to expand their study, and precisely determine if new hospital designs would prove as beneficial and efficient as their first experimental unit for patients requiring only average or minimum nursing care.

To do this, they wish to build a 450-room hospital at a cost of about \$11,500,000. Just as they did not expect the costs of their experimental hospital to be borne completely by outside sources, they equally do not expect the total cost of this new experimental hospital to be borne by the Federal Government.

The Rochester Methodist Hospital representatives have reported to the Appropriations Committee that they could raise—on a local level—about one-third of the construction costs if the Federal Government would provide two-thirds of the costs. This would

come under section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act.

In view of the dramatic results already obtained in this first experiment, and considering the ever-increasing burden which the hospitals of our country will have to face in the future because of increasing population and a greater percentage of older citizens, I strongly urge the Members of this body to support this endeavor. It is a program that will ultimately benefit our entire population.

In addition to urging your support, I will conclude with an expression of keenest admiration for the humane work of the Mayo Clinic and Rochester Methodist Hospital doctors and administrators for this great contribution they have made the common property of all our citizens—continuing in their great medical tradition.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in my remarks a letter directed to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the executive director of the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation of St. Paul, Minn., in connection with this subject of research in hospital design and function:

LOUIS W. AND MAUD HILL
FAMILY FOUNDATION,
St. Paul, Minn., May 8, 1961.

HON. OREN HARRIS,
The House of Representatives, Committee on
Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: This letter is being sent to you at the request of Representative ANCHER NELSON. It is our understanding that your committee wishes to have our evaluation of the contributions to date to hospital care and management which have resulted from the research in hospital design and function being conducted in Rochester, Minn., under the direction of the Rochester Methodist Hospital and the Mayo Clinic. We indeed are happy to comply with this request.

As a preface to our evaluation, may I say that we in the Hill Family Foundation have been concerned for some years over the rapidly increasing costs of hospital care. Our studies of the problem lead us to these conclusions, namely that: (1) solutions to this cost problem must not in any way impair the quality of care rendered patients; (2) since the salaries and wages of professional and nonprofessional personnel account for nearly 70 percent of total hospital costs, this is an area needing thorough study to determine whether such personnel is being enabled to work at maximum efficiency; (3) there is a logical relationship between efficient use of personnel and physical design and equipment of hospitals.

Our study of the literature revealed that there had been no major changes in hospital design for many years and that there had been little objective research or study of the relationships between design, function, efficiency of operations, quality of care and costs.

We were pleased, therefore, to have the opportunity to participate financially in the research undertaken by Rochester Methodist Hospital and the Mayo Clinic. Our support for the first phase of this research undertaking, directed to the care of patients needing constant nursing care, totaled \$100,000.

We believe that the findings of this research clearly demonstrate that there is a direct relationship between design and cost of care of patients needing constant nursing care. We also believe that the results show

that these reductions in costs can be made without impairing the quality of care provided. In fact, there is significant evidence that the quality of care is improved and that patients and their relatives prefer the circular design over the traditional design.

It may seem logical to conclude from this research that the circular design will produce the same savings, improvement in quality of care, and patient satisfaction if applied to patients needing normal nursing and even minimal nursing care. This would be our guess. However, we believe that these stages of care should be studied in the same careful, objective manner before large sums of money are invested in new physical plants.

It is our belief that the results of the research at Rochester provide substantial support for the concept of phase care. However, further research is needed to confirm beyond doubt the validity of this concept. We also believe that the research done to date indicates that it is highly desirable to give further study to other phases of hospital functioning such as new designs of equipment and adaptations of new developments in the fields of electronics and engineering to hospital services and patient care. Certainly the results to date of the research conducted at Rochester Methodist Hospital indicate that these are promising areas for more intensive study.

The fact that a number of new hospitals and major additions to existing hospitals are incorporating the circular design is evidence that the research at Rochester has had an impact upon the hospital management fields. It also is a reason why it is urgent that this research be extended as quickly as possible.

Perhaps the best way to summarize our thinking about the contributions to the hospital field which are coming out of the research at Rochester Methodist Hospital is to say that recently Hill Family Foundation made a grant to the hospital to aid it start research on design and function as related to the care of patients needing minimal nursing care. We sincerely believe that the Rochester Methodist Hospital, Mayo Clinic, and their consultants have opened up a fertile field needing further scientific research and that they are especially well qualified to conduct this research.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. HECKMAN,
Executive Director.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it clear to the gentlemen who so ably serve on the Appropriations Committee, and to my other colleagues in this House, that I have no quarrel with the money request carried in the bill before us today. I shall vote for passage. While there are areas where I, personally, might wish to expand—or reduce—specific items of expenditure, I do not dispute the overall good judgment of the committee which has spent so many long hours studying every facet of the appropriation.

I wish to emphasize my support of grants to our research programs in the vital search for the causes and cures of the many-headed nemesis that stalks mankind—heart disease, cancer, mental illness, crippling diseases. I support the continuation of our Federal share of the hospital construction program, the extension of funds for the National Defense Education Act and of grants to those federally impacted school areas where an unfair share of the tax burden would

otherwise be borne by a community; and assistance to our libraries.

The bill before us today is the fourth fiscal year 1962 appropriation to come before the House. It calls for an expenditure of \$4.327 billion, which is some \$199 million more than was originally requested by President Eisenhower.

Now it is a fact that the Congress and the American taxpayers have been advised by the Kennedy administration that its revised budget requests will plunge the Nation into deficit spending of anywhere from \$2 to \$4 billion for fiscal year 1962. This would make it appear that annual increases in the national debt are becoming as inevitable as death and taxes.

I do not approach the worthwhile measure before us today in the spirit of parsimony. I do, however, have a New England Yankee's regard for the taxpayers' dollar, and I wish to call the attention of the House to a glaring omission.

The bill—which calls for an increase of \$199 million over the original Eisenhower request—takes no cognizance of the fact that the Congress in the past has appropriated some \$166 million which, according to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department has been unable to spend to date and which will be carried over into the following fiscal year. These funds are not obligated.

Many of you who served in the 85th Congress will recall the overwhelming public demand for enactment of H.R. 8002, the Hoover Commission Budget Reform Act. Its purpose was to bring up for annual congressional review these same unexpended, unobligated carryover funds—amounting to as much as \$20 billion in the Department of Defense alone—and to adjust subsequent annual appropriations accordingly.

I am disappointed that the new administration has failed to accompany its budget requests to the Congress with the additional request that Public Law 85-759 be implemented.

You are all familiar with this law. President Eisenhower twice tried to put it into effect. I had hoped that President Kennedy, who sponsored the legislation in the Senate and spoke vigorously for its enactment, would promptly make the same efforts upon taking office.

He has not done so.

Thousands of taxpayers across the country—men and women in every walk of life—who wrote to their Senators and Representatives in the 85th Congress urging enactment of this legislation, are today under the impression that it is actually being implemented, that the promised billions are being saved.

Unfortunately, Public Law 85-759 has been buried alive.

It is due to expire on April 1, 1962. It has never been tried. Time is running out. Without actual operating experience, we will never be able to ascertain whether we in the Congress can take a firmed grip on the Federal pursestrings and thereby give the taxpayers full value for the dollars they entrust to us.

I have taken the taxpayers' case to the White House, determined that they shall have a voice in the National Legislature which will speak out on this is-

APRIL 13, 1961.

sue. I ask leave to insert correspondence with the office of the President which speaks for itself. I have received no responsive answer to my last letter, dated April 13, 1961. I wish also to include a table from page 623 of the budget which shows the carryover balance in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is no carryover in the Department of Labor.

MARCH, 24, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In reading your budget message today, I am disappointed to find that you have made no recommendation that the Congress implement Public Law 85-759.

That this may be an oversight I have no doubt, for I recall the splendid service you performed as a Member of the 85th Congress when you introduced this legislation in the Senate and worked so vigorously to secure its passage. I remember, too, the outstanding efforts put forth by Ambassador Kennedy, as a member of the Second Hoover Commission, in behalf of this budget reform measure.

In view of the fact that the budget you have sent us today is precariously balanced on a tightrope of "ifs"—and in view of the fact that the Defense budget you will send us next week is reported to call for a deficit of as much as \$1.5 billion—it seems to me vital that Public Law 85-759 be implemented at once. As you point out in your message, should present revenue estimates prove overly optimistic, this deficit undoubtedly will be greater still.

Implementation of Public Law 85-759 might well help overcome such a deficit.

The Bureau of the Budget advises me that as of the end of fiscal year 1960, unobligated carry-over balances in various Federal departments had reached the staggering figure of \$37.565 billion—nearly one-half the total of the proposed budget. At the end of the calendar year 1960, \$20 billion in Defense funds and more than \$7 billion in foreign aid funds existed in unobligated carry-over balance.

Implementation of Public Law 85-759 would return to the Treasury a substantial amount of this tremendous, unspent, unobligated sum of money. It would, to quote your own excellent speech on the floor of the Senate on June 5, 1957:

"Prevent a great carryover of funds, both with respect to foreign aid, and defense, which makes it almost impossible for us (the Congress) to know exactly what we are doing, and the effect our actions will have on the amount of money available to the executive branch. * * * This bill, in combination with the cost-basis bill which was passed last year, will give us far greater control over the amount of money the Government will spend in each year. * * * The reason why the Hoover Commission stated that it would save hundreds of millions of dollars is that placing this system in operation in business has brought about savings of 1, 2, and as much as 3 percent."

Estimates at the time, by experts, ran as high as \$4 billion in annual savings if the legislation were enacted. It seems to me this would be an important savings today when our national debt has hit the \$285 billion mark, and you warn us that it must go higher still before June 30.

Twice, since enactment of Public Law 85-759 in 1958, President Eisenhower submitted appropriation requests subject to limitation on annual accrued expenditures. In his fiscal 1960 budget, six such limitations were proposed. Exercising its prerogative under

the law, the House Committee on Appropriations eliminated the accrued expenditures proposals. President Eisenhower submitted 12 limitations in his fiscal 1961 budget. Again the House Committee on Appropriations refused to adopt them. Apparently despairing of receiving any cooperation from the committee, President Eisenhower omitted all such recommendations from his fiscal 1962 money requests.

Public Law 85-759 will expire on April 1, 1962. The budget reform the Congress promised the American taxpayers has never, in fact, taken place. I am sure you vividly remember the flood of mail from thousands of concerned citizens, in all walks of life, urging passage of the Kennedy bill, S. 434, and its House companion, H.R. 8002. I have no doubt that these citizens are under the impression that now that the law is on the books the promised billions are being saved.

In truth, Public Law 85-759 has been buried alive.

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that as Chief Executive, with the economic stability of our Nation as one of your foremost responsibilities, you resubmit your budget requests with the addition of accrued expenditure limitations for those agencies which have established a system of accrual accounting. I respectfully suggest, also, that as leader of the party which controls the Congress, and the committees of the Congress, your recommendation that Public Law 85-759 be implemented will meet with a warmer reception than was accorded President Eisenhower.

I feel that this is a matter of the utmost urgency if the Congress is to recapture its constitutional control over the power of the Federal purse, and if the American taxpayer is to be given some hope of fiscal responsibility in the management of his hard-earned tax dollar. I am certain that you share my deep concern.

Respectfully,

F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
April 8, 1961.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRAD: The President has asked me to acknowledge your recent letter on accrued expenditure limitations.

When the President was a Member of Congress, he supported the Hoover Commission recommendation to change the method of appropriating to the accrued expenditure basis. Legislation introduced for this purpose was modified before enactment to provide for accrued expenditure limitations within appropriations on an obligation basis. In accordance with this legislation, accrued expenditure limitations were proposed in the budgets for 1960 and 1961 for certain appropriations. These limitations were rejected by the Congress.

The principal operating advantages and economies to be obtained from the Hoover Commission proposals on budgeting and accounting are those associated with the adoption of accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting. As you know, both of these have been widely adopted in the civilian agencies of the Government, so that by the end of the fiscal year over 75 percent of the budgeting and accounting for civilian agencies will be on these bases. The President has asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to press toward rapid completion of the conversion of the remaining civilian agencies and the Defense Department to accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting methods.

Sincerely yours,

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

Mr. MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: Thank you, sir, for your acknowledgment of April 8 of my March 24 letter to the President.

President Kennedy deserves only the highest praise for his splendid efforts, as a Member of Congress, in behalf of Hoover Commission recommendations—particularly in his fight to place appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis. It is precisely because I know his keen interest in this important area that I felt no hesitation in calling to his attention the failure to implement Public Law 85-759. It seems to me an ideal opportunity for the President to put his Kennedy Budget Reform Act into effect—or at least attempt to persuade those of his party who control the Appropriations Committee to do so.

In your second paragraph, Mike, you point out that accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting procedures have been widely adopted by civilian agencies of the Government, so that by the end of this fiscal year more than 75 percent of them will be operating on these bases. This is a fine achievement, accomplished over the last 5 years under Public Law 84-863. However, Public Law 84-863 does only half the job. To obtain the full operating advantages and economies possible, Public Law 85-759 must also be implemented. The President himself pointed this out in a speech he made, as junior Senator from Massachusetts, on the Senate floor on June 5, 1957. In urging passage of his bill, S. 434, he stated that it " * * * in combination with the cost-basis bill which was passed last year, will give us far greater control over the amount of money the Government will spend in each year."

In a word, implementation of Public Law 84-863, as outlined in the second paragraph of your letter is progressing satisfactorily. But, to be truly meaningful, implementation of Public Law 85-759 must also be made. And Public Law 85-759 has been buried alive.

In 1959, a year after Public Law 85-759 was enacted, President Eisenhower proposed limitations on six relatively small appropriations as starting points for putting the law into effect. The House Appropriations Committee struck the limitations from all six appropriations.

Among these appropriations was that of the Panama Canal Zone Government. Representatives of the Canal Zone Government thereupon went before the Senate Appropriations Committee with a strong plea for reinstatement of the limitations. They pointed out that their appropriation had been on a cost basis for 6 years and emphasized their conviction that to gain maximum benefits from Public Law 84-863, implementation of Public Law 85-759 was a necessary and logical step.

On being asked by Senator HOLLAND, of the Appropriations Committee, whether he saw any benefits to be gained by adoption of the limitations, the Comptroller of the Canal Zone testified:

"I believe there are benefits that do accrue through control of accrual expenditures. I think it places Congress in a position to review through its budgetary techniques, current expenditure requirements, which is really the best measure of accrual accomplishments, and by extension, it is the best point of performance control. It insures the opportunity of review and approval of an expenditure program annually, and any interim deviations from a planned program would automatically be brought to the attention of the Congress."

The Senate subcommittee reinstated the limitations on the Canal Zone appropriation

and, after its passage by the Senate, Senator HOLLAND, as one of the conferees, indicated he would fight for retention of the limitations. Nevertheless, the conferees struck the last remaining limitation.

As I pointed out in my earlier letter, President Eisenhower proposed 12 appropriation limitations the following year. The Appropriations Committee again rejected them.

At a time when the Nation is plunging more and more into deficit spending, at a time when we will be asked to once more raise the temporary ceiling on the national debt, it seems to me absolutely vital that as responsible guardians of the public treasure, we must search for every means of conserving unnecessary expenditures. Public Law 85-759 offers that opportunity—offers it without stripping worthwhile spending projects of needed funds and without slowing down acceleration of programs which must be stepped up in the national interest.

I respectfully reiterate my suggestion that as Chief Executive, with the economic stability of our Nation as one of his most important responsibilities, the President resubmit his budget requests with the addition of accrued expenditure limitations for those agencies which have established a system of accrual accounting.

I respectfully reiterate my suggestion that as leader of the party which controls the Congress, and the committees of the Congress, his recommendation that Public Law 85-759 be implemented could meet with a warmer reception than was accorded President Eisenhower.

Time is running short. Public Law 85-759 expires on April 1, 1962. Without actual operating experience, we will never be able to ascertain whether it is possible for Congress to take a firmer grip on the Federal purse strings and thereby give the taxpayers full value for the dollars they entrust to us.

Sincerely,

F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Member of Congress.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Balance, start of 1962

[In thousands of dollars]

Appropriations:	Unobligated
Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and other services, Food and Drug Administration	646
Pharmacological-animal laboratory, Food and Drug Administration	
Grants for library services, Office of Education	916
Payments to school districts, Office of Education	
Assistance for school construction, Office of Education	
Defense educational activities, Office of Education	19,331
Research and training (special foreign currency program), Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	120
Buildings and facilities, Public Health Service	1,699
Hospital construction activities, Public Health Service	124,500
Grants for waste treatment works construction, Public Health Service	5,000
Medical care and foreign quarantine, Public Health Service	
Construction of Indian health facilities, Public Health Service	806
General research and services, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service	
National Cancer Institute, Public Health Service	
Mental health activities, Public Health Service	

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Balance, start of 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Appropriations:	Unobligated
National Heart Institute, Public Health Service	
Grants for construction of health research facilities, Public Health Service	
Communicable disease activities, Public Health Service	
Construction of mental health-neurology research facility, Public Health Service	12,048
Construction, mental health facilities, Alaska, Public Health Service	
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	57
Construction and equipment, treatment and cafeteria buildings, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	525
Extension and modernization of administration building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	84
Construction, continued treatment building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	
Construction and equipment of treatment building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	
Construction and equipment, maximum security building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	
Grants to States for public assistance, Social Security Administration	
Construction, Gallaudet College	197
Plans and specifications, Howard University	34
Construction of buildings, Howard University	247
Construction of men's dormitory (liquidation of contract authorization) Howard University	
White House Conference on Aging, Office of the Secretary	
Other	
Subtotal	166,211
Balance of anticipated pay increase supplementals included above	
Total appropriations	166,211
Contract authorizations:	
Auditorium, Howard University	440
Other	
Total, contract authorizations	440
Revolving and management funds:	
Advances and reimbursements, Office of Education	
Operation of commissaries, narcotic hospitals Public Health Service	29
Bureau of State Services management fund, Public Health Service	
National Institutes of Health management funds, Public Health Service	
Service and supply fund, Public Health Service	2
Working capital fund, narcotic hospitals, Public Health Service	76
Advances and reimbursements, Public Health Service	
Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Social Security Administration	794
Advances and reimbursements, Social Security Administration	
Working capital fund, Office of the Secretary	81

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Balance, start of 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Unobligated
Revolving and management funds:
Other
Total, revolving and management funds
982
Proposed for later transmission:
Appropriation other than pay increase supplementals
Anticipated pay increase supplemental appropriations
Total, proposed for later transmission
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
167,633

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman a question. I note in the hearings that \$1,118 was expended in Iowa to take care of the fishing industry. I did not know we had a commercial fishing industry in Iowa that required Federal funds. In the hearings I also read that the money was spent for care and maintenance of marine engines and fish nets. How much money for this purpose is being spent around the country?

Mr. MARSHALL. I think what the gentleman is referring to is the money that is used in the vocational educational end of the program, and it is being used to display salesmanship and so on in relation to fish. The testimony before the committee was that this was a very worthwhile part of distributive education in that it was familiarizing people just how to handle a product which is extremely valuable to the dietary requirements of the people.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

[Mr. MICHEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to the members of his subcommittee for their outstanding work on this bill. Particularly, Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to see the emphasis being placed on expanding the medical research programs. Certainly, nothing is more important to this Nation than the health of our citizens.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for the work they have done, and I concur with the gentleman from Oklahoma in his remarks in regard to research in the problem of medical care in our country.

There is no doubt in my mind, and I believe this to be true with the majority of American citizens, that we must be concerned about health.

During the past 15 years this country has made great progress in the attack on disease, in the construction of hospitals, and development of other medical facilities.

But a great deal more is to be done. Expansion of present fields of research, establishment of new fields, training of medical personnel, and the availability of medical services to the people, need our serious study and support.

To save a life, to lessen pain, to cure the maimed—these are worthwhile goals for which our dollars are spent wisely. And more dollars are needed.

I join with my colleagues in support of legislation that will provide the plans and means to support a program for medical research, medical training, and medical service, not only to benefit this generation, but those to come.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it is a rewarding experience to serve on the appropriations subcommittee for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. In one way or another, the work of these agencies touches on the life of every American family.

Our chairman, JOHN FOGARTY, well deserves the nationwide reputation he has earned for his great service to humanity. Many witnesses before the committee know first hand of his dedicated work as a Member of Congress. Many organizations have learned to appreciate and support his judgment. The consideration and fairness he shows as chairman makes it a pleasure to work with him.

My goodhearted friend from Indiana, WINFIELD DENTON, brings to the subcommittee legal training and experience together with genuine sympathy and understanding of the human problems with which we deal. The people of his State can be rightly proud of his effective contribution to this important work.

During the years I have served with Congressman LAIRD, I have learned to appreciate more and more his working knowledge of the intricacies of many of these programs. He is a tireless worker who makes a real effort to understand every phase of an agency's work.

We were joined this year by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. Since it was my privilege to serve with him on the agricultural appropriations subcommittee, his efforts are not new to me. A man of ability and common-sense, he is making a genuine contribution to the subcommittee.

Throughout our long and sometimes arduous hearings, all of us appreciated the services of Robert Moyer, our well-

informed and able clerk whose work is uniformly excellent.

In addition to the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we consider appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, and the U.S. Soldiers' Home. For the most part, these agencies render good and necessary service. Their activities are covered in some detail in our report.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT CREDITS

I do, however, want to call special attention to an untidy situation that continues in regard to the railroad retirement trust fund. We have consistently urged that payments be approved to cover the military service credits authorized by law. It seems to me that the provisions of this law should be carried out; every day of delay only postpones the reckoning that must come.

Continued delay is bad budgeting and is unfair to members of the system as well as the taxpayers of the country. It is my understanding that a proposal will be made to the Bureau of the Budget to bring contributions to the fund up to date in five of six installments. I urge the Bureau to recognize this obligation to implement the law passed by Congress and to restore confidence in proper budgeting procedure.

U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

In studying the testimony concerning the U.S. Soldiers' Home, I am impressed by the efficiency with which it is administered by Gen. Wade H. Haislip and his staff. As Governor of the Home, he is to be congratulated on this fine record.

BOGGED IN PAPERWORK

The work of the Department of Labor has always interested me, but I am constantly amazed at the great mass of paperwork required of this agency. I am disappointed that the legislative committee and the Congress have not given more attention to eliminating useless paperwork and the resulting unnecessary expense.

An obvious example is the collection of reports of little or no real value or legal purpose. Thousands and thousands of these reports are accumulating under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Both former Secretary Mitchell and the present Secretary Goldberg have called attention to the situation without avail.

NO ENFORCEMENT POWERS

Not only do we bear the needless cost of employees and facilities but we contribute to the public illusion that the Secretary of Labor has enforcement powers. Commenting on this shameful deception, Secretary Mitchell said last year that the act provides "no persuasive deterrent to those who wish to ignore its provisions, or to manipulate or embezzle funds."

It is almost unbelievable that assets and insurance reserves of over \$40 billion, which are intended to provide over 400,000 different benefits to 80 million

workers, are so little protected. Yet administration of a law which does not provide this protection will cost about \$580,000 next year.

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN COSTS

We encountered a similar situation in examining operations under the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (Landrum-Griffin Act). The bill before you includes \$5,775,000 for purposes of the act. In 3 years, Department of Labor expenses under the bill will cost the taxpayers about \$13,467,000.

If a law is measured by the number of jobs it creates, this one has been a success since the budget requested funds for 596 positions. The Bureau of Labor Management reports originally requested 986 positions and \$7,500,000 for administration of the law.

STATE LAWS APPLY

Our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], inquired into criminal actions to date. We were informed that there are 10 cases for embezzlement of funds. Convictions have been obtained in six. The Department admitted that State laws would usually cover these cases. It was stated that 1,469 alleged violations are under investigation but this figure is meaningless, in my opinion, since a great many will be dropped upon completion of the investigations.

When the Landrum-Griffin bill was before the Congress, people all over the country were barraged with propaganda originating mostly from antilabor sources. Some of this was misleading; and some, downright false. Because of their legitimate concern over conditions disclosed by committees of the Congress, many people accepted the propaganda without further investigation.

EFFECT OF HASTY ACTION

The very people often interested in a balanced budget and economy in Government, wrote, wired, telephoned, and visited Members of Congress to demand immediate adoption of the bill. Congress responded to the pressure generated by these activities. What has happened is a good example of what can happen when we legislate in this kind of climate.

In the face of these preposterous expenditures, I suggest that the Congress reappraise its action. Even the Department of Labor budget does not tell the whole story since the Department of Justice and the National Labor Relations Board are also involved in this flurry of fruitless activity.

REDUCTIONS IN LABOR BUDGET

The overall appropriation for the Department of Labor included in this bill is \$283,113,000, a reduction of \$2,179,000 below the budget request, and \$791,447,800 less than appropriated for 1961. The large reduction is accounted for by action which made appropriations of \$500 million for the Federal extended compensation account and \$248 million for the unemployment trust fund unnecessary in the present bill. A reduction of \$30 million was made in unemployment compensation funds for Federal employees and ex-servicemen and \$18,924,-

000 in grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.

I hope the Congress accepts our recommendation for an increase of \$500,000 for the promotion of industrial training programs by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. We have consistently urged an effective program for the training of skilled industrial workers. At a time when both unemployment and the demand for skilled workers are high, the lesson is clear.

RE STUDY BUILDING COSTS

In our report, we call attention on page 6 to some disturbing testimony on the proposed construction of a building at 6th and Pennsylvania Avenues to house the employment service and unemployment compensation activities of the District of Columbia. Present operation and maintenance cost to the Government is \$2.21 per square foot per year, while the estimated cost in this building would be \$4.45 per square foot—more than double present costs. This is a considerable increase; we have recommended, therefore, that construction be delayed pending further study or until more information is presented to justify construction.

The overall appropriations for the many and varied activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are slightly more than \$4 billion. Some of the programs involved are being discussed in greater detail by other Members, but I want to direct attention to a few of special concern both because of existing programs and because of new legislation pending in this Congress.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The Office of Education was created by an act of March 2, 1867, to collect such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education, to diffuse such information as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise to promote the cause of education.

While both the authority and operations of the Office have been greatly expanded by subsequent acts and executive orders, one of its major functions continues to be the collection and dissemination of information concerning education. This is certainly a proper and important purpose. The new Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, acknowledged this in his opening statement before our subcommittee:

We are cognizant of the need for strengthening the Office as an agency for the acquisition and dissemination of accurate up-to-date information on all phases of education.

NEED UP-TO-DATE STATISTICS

As the Federal Government moves into more and more areas of education, we need more current facts and accurate figures on which to base public policy decisions. Unfortunately, we often find that the faster and farther the Office of Education moves into new programs, the less up-to-date information we can get.

When the Congress is being asked to consider a whole series of new programs

in the field of education, we must have factual information upon which to base the practical decisions we are asked to make.

AGREEMENT ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS

Let me make it clear from the outset that there is no quarrel with the intention of any of these programs. I know of no Member of Congress who is not interested in promoting the best educational opportunities our resources can provide. No conscientious citizen can be indifferent to the welfare of all of the schools of this country, whether devoted to public or private elementary, secondary, or higher education.

All of us want to make all of our schools as truly effective agencies of education as the resources of this Nation permit. This concern and determination is too real and too immediate to need elaborate embellishment.

FACED WITH PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

The test, however, is in applying our intentions to concrete action. Although we can agree on purposes, we must legislate in the area of ways and means. We are faced with practical questions of how it should be done, when it should be done, and in what measure it should be done. There are differences in practical judgments which can be resolved only on the basis of objective facts that will enable us to fairly evaluate the alternatives available to us.

Yet today we often find that there is no single fact or set of facts upon which proponents and opponents of any program can agree, whether it be the teacher shortage, the classroom lag, the scale of local effort, the extent of local initiative, or whatever. Instead of facts based on consistent and valid standards, we seem to be getting a wide variety of conflicting opinions.

BUREAU OF BUDGET CRITICISM

The Bureau of the Budget has criticized the Office of Education's figures on the classroom shortage and has commented on their inaccuracy for purposes of policy discussion.

In 1950, Congress ordered a survey of facilities at a cost of over \$5 million and the Office of Education reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. In 1954, the Commissioner testified that the shortage had grown to 370,000 classrooms and other experts predicted it would rise to 600,000 in 3 years.

ESTIMATES ARE REVISED

Yet, when the White House Conference on Education polled the States, it reported a shortage of 198,625 classrooms. The Office of Education revised its estimate, and by 1959 the estimated shortage was 132,000 classrooms.

On his final day in office, January 9, 1961, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare released a report showing a shortage of 142,000 classrooms. This is the same figure given to us at our hearing on April 12.

NO OBJECTIVE STANDARDS

In response to a question I asked, concerning objective standards in determining classroom shortages so that valid comparisons could be made between States, we were told:

There is a variation among States in regard to the standards. There is no uniform standard that is accepted or adopted by the 50 States. In some States they have standards written out in much greater detail than in others. In some States they have standards just for the construction of new buildings that they are going to build. * * * The answer specifically to your question: "There is a difference among the States in the standards."

CLASSROOM CONSTRUCTION HOLDS

Based on this wide variety of standards, the report of January 19, 1961, estimated a need for 607,600 classrooms in the next 10 years. This suggests construction of 60,760 classrooms a year. The same report says that we have been building classrooms at the rate of about 70,000 a year for the past 5 years.

Even if local efforts should decrease by 13 percent, it appears that the need would be met without any Federal activity. Persistent predictions that construction activity would decline have not materialized—despite some lag which can certainly be attributed to perennial promises of Federal assistance.

In any event, what assurance have we that today's predictions are more accurate than those of 10 years ago, 5 years ago, or last year?

OUTDATED FIGURES ANOTHER PROBLEM

These are examples of the questions that must inevitably occur when Congress is given contradictory figures on which it is expected to base practical judgments. Still another problem occurs when the figures are out of date. For example, the most recent issue of the bulletin on Federal funds for education listing expenditures by all departments is bulletin No. 2, published in 1959 and covering the years 1956-57 and 1957-58. Incidentally, this bulletin shows that Federal assistance for educational programs for the 1956-57 school year totaled \$1,997,825,000 of which \$656,632,000 was spent on elementary and secondary education and \$1,032,374,000 on higher education. Surely, when expenditures of this magnitude are already being made for educational purposes, it would be useful to have more current information at a time when additional expenditures are being asked.

We need to know not only how much is being spent, but what effect these expenditures are having in meeting the problems they are intended to alleviate. We are asked to inaugurate programs based on projections into the future without knowing what the present situation is. The Commissioner and other witnesses indicated that efforts will be made to update the statistical gathering apparatus so that reports and bulletins will have more than historical interest.

I hope these efforts will be carried on with the same urgency so often displayed when some new expansion of authority of operations is requested.

NDEA FACTS UNAVAILABLE

The problem of obtaining current factual information is also illustrated in our discussion of the administration of the National Defense Education Act. Some school administrators have privately expressed misgivings about acting as collection agencies for the student

loan program. Since collections do not begin until 1 year after graduation, there is no way to anticipate the experiences that lie ahead.

After 2 full years of operation, we still have no factual reports on the number of student borrowers who have dropped out of school or the collection problems created by dropouts. We do know that over 25 percent of the institutions of high learning are not taking part in this program. Again, however, we do not know why such a sizable number has chosen not to take part in the Federal loan program. Nor do we know what proportion of the funds are being used by State universities as compared to private institutions. Nor do we know the average loan made in either case.

HOPE FOR EARLY REPORT

Although the program is scheduled to expire on July 1, 1962, efforts are already underway to extend it and we have been told that if the Congress does so, additional funds will have to be appropriated in a supplemental bill either in this session or the next.

The Office of Education informs us that an extensive study of the loan program is in progress and that information will be forthcoming. I hope that the Congress will have the report sufficiently early to enable Members to study the actual operations and effects of the program during the past 2 years before we are asked to decide on extending or expanding it.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

We do have a little more information on the fellowship program under title IV of the act. This is frequently referred to in testimony as the national defense fellowship program and it is part of the National Defense Education Act. Of the 1,000 students participating in the first year's program, about 90 dropped out, according to the testimony we received. No figures were available for the second year.

The professed purpose of the program is to upgrade college teachers and there continues to be confusion about its relationship to national defense, the professed purpose of the act itself. Last year we had some discussion about the contribution of fellowships in American folklore to the Nation's defense. This year English folklore has been added to the list.

RELATION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE?

Other questions have occurred concerning fellowships in contemporary literature—also modern literature—dramatic art, theater and speech, musicology, sociology of marriage and family living, and a series of similarly unrelated subjects. These may be necessary and worthwhile studies and college teachers in these areas may need upgrading, but do they fulfill the intent of Congress in passing the National Defense Education Act?

In response to a question on the subject, Dr. McMurrin said:

I would like to say that I believe that sooner or later we are going to have to recog-

nize that the real problem of American defense is tied up with the whole strength of our culture. Although it is possible for us to jest a good deal about a thing like American folklore, and this kind of jesting is very common in the American universities, it is still true that a genuine grasp and appreciation of and capacity for critical analysis of American culture is very considerably strengthened by studies in American folklore.

QUESTIONS OF STATE PRESSURE?

Questions are arising concerning another phase of the NDEA program which provides grants to States and loans to private schools for purposes of elementary and secondary instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Since grant funds are funneled through the States, there is always danger of State pressure on local systems to participate beyond their own desires.

Although it is true that such pressures are often indirect and therefore impossible to control from Washington under the act as written, we ought to have some idea of what local school boards and administrators think of the program at that level.

In response to a direct question on the subject, the Office of Education said that no attempt has been made to determine local sentiment. Since the ultimate test of effectiveness is at the local level, reviews and consultations with State departments do not necessarily accurately reflect opinion at the working level.

IMPRESSIVE WORK FOR RETARDED

During consideration of the Office of Education budget, we received impressive testimony on the work being done with the \$1 million appropriation for training teachers of mentally retarded children. We have continued the funds within the statutory limitation but have suggested that the legislative committee give consideration to expanding the program to include teachers of children with speech and hearing defects.

It is estimated that only one-fourth of the more than a million retarded children are receiving suitable education. Throughout the years, a major problem has been the shortage of trained teachers. Grants made to colleges and universities under this program enable them to conduct teacher training programs. State agencies are assisted in preparing persons to supervise the special educational programs required in State and local school systems.

Thus, this modest appropriation is already showing results that warrant further consideration to determine what action can be usefully taken to strengthen this important endeavor.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NEED

The bill before you continues the vocational education program at its present level. We discussed the problems arising from unemployment due to automation or migration of industries since special programs are being inaugurated in these areas. There is no evidence, however, that the traditional courses in the distributive occupations, agriculture, and practical nursing are less needed. With our continued population growth, training in these fields continues to enhance

employment opportunities by upgrading individuals in their vocational specialties.

Because the program is national in scope and application, its purposes are not limited to specific area problems which can best be met by restricted programs. This does not discount the local impact of vocational education programs on improved employment opportunities and better trained workers. The local support given the program is the best testimony we have to its usefulness and its effectiveness at the community level.

FEDERAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE

Another subject of particular interest to your committee in studying the budget requests for educational purposes is Federal assistance to so-called impacted areas. Many of us, regardless of our position on across-the-board subsidies for school construction and teachers' salaries, have supported this program.

Despite some recent press insinuations to the contrary, there is no inconsistency in this position. When local school districts are clearly and presently faced with an added burden as a direct result of Federal activity which increases school population while reducing local tax income, the Federal Government has a clear and present responsibility to assist in meeting it. The problem is created by the Federal Government and justice demands that the Federal Government accept responsibility for assisting parents and the local communities in providing for the education of their children. Congress recognized this obligation in making permanent the provisions of Public Law 874 which relates to children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property.

DESERVES SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

The House will be asked to consider extensions and revisions of these programs, presumably in connection with the general Federal aid bill. This creates problems for members who believe that these are two entirely different programs that deserve to stand on their own merits. Legislation to extend assistance to impacted areas includes questions enough for one good debate.

This can be illustrated by taking a look at the allotments made in the District of Columbia area under Public Laws 874 and 815:

Actual and estimated entitlements under Public Law 874 of school districts in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area for fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962 (as of Apr. 14, 1961)

School district	Fiscal year 1960 (actual)	Fiscal year 1961 (estimated)	Fiscal year 1962 (estimated) ¹
Montgomery County, Md.	\$2,272,000	\$2,489,000	\$15,119
Prince Georges County, Md.	1,967,082	2,310,000	84,744
Alexandria City, Va.	626,726	649,000	
Arlington County, Va.	1,523,030	1,541,000	66,355
Fairfax County, Va.	3,192,564	3,587,000	110,298
Falls Church City, Va.	121,937	117,000	

¹ Based on Public Law 874 without extension or amendment.

Summary of construction aid under Public Law 815 of school districts in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area for fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962 (as of Apr. 14, 1961)

School district	Fiscal year 1960 (actual)	Fiscal year 1961 (estimated)	Fiscal year 1962 (estimated)
Montgomery County, Md.	\$2, 233, 437	\$131, 376	-----
Prince Georges County, Md.	1, 066, 062	742, 468	-----
Alexandria City, Va.	54, 640	-----	-----
Arlington County, Va.	2, 069, 136	1, 726, 474	-----
Fairfax County, Va.	19, 200	-----	-----
Falls Church City, Va.	-----	-----	-----

¹ Based on Public Law 815 without extension or amendment.

HELP OR HINDRANCE?

These programs have frequently been justified as providing payments in lieu of taxes, and rightly so in cases where Federal installations and landholdings have seriously reduced possible sources of tax revenue while increasing the school population through Federal activity. Do the counties and cities listed really qualify under this test?

This is a question frequently discussed in the Congress but never really resolved. Has the employment offered by the Federal Government been detrimental or beneficial to these communities? Has it decreased or increased the tax base? I can assure you that there are many communities in this country that would welcome the employment opportunities at the salary levels available in this area.

The legislative decisions involved cannot be made by our appropriations subcommittee. I think, however, that our experience with the program and the testimony we receive indicate that revision of this program properly merits separate consideration so that its worthwhile achievements are not lost because of unrelated controversies.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS RISE

One other item in the Office of Education budget illustrates the growth of this agency over a relatively short period of time. In 1952, we appropriated \$3,447,713 for the salaries and expenses of 438 permanent employees. Last year, we appropriated \$13,400,000 for the salaries and expenses of 1,047 employees, 104 of whom are assigned to regional offices.

The bill before you includes \$11,364,000 for salaries and expenses, \$2,511,000 less than was appropriated last year. However, funds for the Cooperative Research Program are considered as a separate appropriation so this amount is actually \$846,000 more than was available for similar purposes last year. The committee did make a reduction of \$500,000 from the budget request with the declared intention that it be applied primarily to the additional positions requested.

EXPANSION BEARS WATCHING

With most of the regional representatives meeting in Washington twice a year and the additional communications expenses, the operations of the field offices deserve watching or we will find

the familiar pattern of empire-building at work. This is not a direct criticism of the Office of Education, but anyone experienced in the executive and legislative branches knows too well how fast these little sovereignties grow into big kingdoms.

Let me emphasize that these comments bear no ill will. All of us are anxious to make the Office of Education as efficient and effective an agency of Government as we possibly can. We wish the new Commissioner and his staff every success in strengthening and improving the services provided by law.

This is a time of new beginnings, and we want to be helpful in preventing the kinds of abuses and inadequacies that can only lead to disillusionment and bitter criticism later.

SENSITIVITY TO SUGGESTIONS

I have always regarded it as an important responsibility of the legislator to help administrators anticipate troubles and correct mistakes when programs are in the formative stage. Some officials are needlessly sensitive to suggestions; however constructive and well intentioned, and refuse to engage in candid discussions of shortcomings while there is still time to correct them.

In working with the details of these programs more intimately than most committees, we come to recognize patterns that often indicate the success or failure of programs. My own policy has been to bring the questions that occur to the attention of the administrators concerned in our hearings, rather than in press releases casting discredit on an entire agency or program. Neither false geniality nor bitter rancor serve the cooperative effort necessary to achieve our common goals.

REAL PROGRESS IN REHABILITATION

In our hearings on Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, I never fail to be impressed by the encouraging results of our vocational rehabilitation programs. While we can never be satisfied with the progress in this important work, we are heartened by evidence that real progress is being made.

Few programs receive such widespread and deserving support in our committee and in the Congress. Last year, 88,275 disabled men and women were returned to a useful working life through this program. In 1961, an estimated 96,000 will go on to gainful work, and we hope that this number will grow to 107,000 in 1962. Numbers alone, however, do not measure the full meaning of this program in human terms.

PROBLEM CONSTANTLY GROWING

Cheered as we are by this progress, the problem is so immense that we need to go forward more rapidly only to keep from falling farther behind. Those who are devoting their lives to this work tell us that between 2.5 and 3 million of our 20 million disabled citizens can be returned to satisfying and gainful employment. Each year, another 250,000 persons are disabled by injury or disease to the extent of requiring assistance and training in order to continue useful occupations.

We have included \$19,250,000 for research and training in this vital field, an increase of \$2 million over the budget request and \$3,820,000 over last year's appropriation. This \$2 million increase includes an additional \$1 million to accelerate the training program, and \$1 million to establish two regional institutes of rehabilitation.

SEVERE SHORTAGE OF SPECIALISTS

One of the major obstacles in providing rehabilitation services is the severe shortage of specialists in physical medicine and rehabilitation—psychiatrists.

Of the more than 250,000 physicians licensed to practice medicine in this country, only 369 are certified psychiatrists.

At this time, only 143 graduate medical students are trained in this field.

In 1959, only 57 percent of the residencies in physical medicine and rehabilitation were filled.

Only half of the Nation's medical schools have men on their staffs who are qualified to teach physical medicine and rehabilitation.

MANY SKILLS NEEDED

Due to the comprehensive and intensive nature of the treatment necessary for rehabilitation of the chronically ill and disabled, the coordinated efforts of many skilled specialists, in addition to the psychiatrist, are required. Specially trained nurses, physical therapists, occupational therapists, psychologists, speech therapists, vocational counselors, and others are essential to a successful rehabilitation program.

Also, there is a constantly widening gap between modern procedures in rehabilitation and the techniques generally in use in hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers. The availability of well-trained personnel and greater emphasis on physical medicine and rehabilitation at the graduate and undergraduate levels of our medical schools would greatly reduce the timelag between the development of new procedures and their use in general practice.

NEED NIH-TYPE SUPPORT

Research programs being supported by the National Institutes of Health have limited application to physical medicine and rehabilitation, but the analysis of the causes of disabling diseases does not directly benefit such programs. Yet rehabilitation and physical medicine receive far less research support, Government or voluntary, than any major health field.

Research funds alone will not assure profitable investigations; they need to be evaluated and determined by specialists who know the areas which need study and can direct the research toward rewarding results.

RECOMMEND PILOT PROGRAM

For this reason, your committee recommends the establishment of this pilot program for two regional institutes to study the means of developing adequate facilities for graduate medical education and research. They should be as comprehensive in support of rehabilitation as the National Institutes of Health are

in their support of categorical medical research programs.

The program should be comprehensive enough to afford the medical student the broadest possible view of the field. It should be conducted at high level to familiarize the student with the most advanced learning in the field and give him an understanding of the potential it offers in both treatment and research. It should provide an opportunity for students to come in contact with leaders in the field, since this is recognized as one of the most influential factors in the selection of a specialty.

UTILIZE EXISTING KNOW-HOW

Certainly consideration should be given to medical schools and research institutions that are now acknowledged leaders in this effort. The institutes should be established in connection with medical schools which have developed the comprehensive program we have outlined.

The pilot plans should establish formal arrangements for cooperation with a voluntary rehabilitation center providing rehabilitation services on a regional basis in order to test and demonstrate how university, State, and voluntary agencies can cooperate to provide rehabilitation services.

MANY FACETS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Another section of the bill which has great interest for all of us is that dealing with the activities of the Public Health Service. It is impossible to discuss any or all of these items in the detail they deserve; I can only urge Members to read the hearings.

Problems unheard of as recently as 10 or 15 years ago give evidence of the growing complexities of the society in which we live. Programs dealing with air pollution control, radiological health, water pollution control, foreign quarantine activities, and hospital design rank with older efforts to control tuberculosis, venereal diseases, and improve food sanitation.

REVOLUTIONARY HOSPITAL DESIGN

Particular attention is properly being paid to hospital design and the construction of auxiliary facilities for the care of the chronically ill and aged to relieve the expense and congestion of hospital care. I am especially interested in the work of the Public Health Service to improve nursing home care for the aged since there is evidence that many people could receive better care in such homes in an environment that would be much happier than that of our crowded medical institutions.

The committee is greatly interested in these developments and we were impressed by the work being done in hospital design at the Rochester Methodist Hospital in Rochester, Minn. Revolutionary new designs promise the kind of economical construction and efficient operation that are necessary if we are to provide hospital care at reasonable costs for our growing population.

GENEROUS SUPPORT OF NIH

Since our chairman has given you a summary of the efforts and accomplishments of the National Institutes of Health, I merely want to make a few

observations on some of the practical considerations that should interest all of us. The Congress has generously supported this unprecedented effort to conquer disease and we can be proud of some of the results. Again, we are always impatient with the progress made in programs so directly concerned with human life and human suffering.

Dollars and cents are not an accurate standard by which such work can be measured and every breakthrough has special meaning for each of us. Two diseases alone, heart ailment and cancer, touch the lives of almost every family in the United States. Every new advance in eliminating or treating them is of immeasurable worth.

CAN IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION

But, because this work is so important and of such personal consequence, we are rightfully concerned that the best possible use be made of the resources committed to it. Appropriations have increased from \$53,386,000 in 1952 to \$560 million this year. The committee is recommending \$641 million for 1962, which is \$58 million more than requested in the budget and \$81 million more than appropriated for 1961.

The generosity of the American people in support of these programs imposes a grave obligation to use every dollar as wisely as possible. I confess to misgivings about some of the fiscal operations involved in the rapid expansion of so many research programs. Not because I want less done, but because I want more done with the resources we have assigned to this great humanitarian endeavor.

A report of the Committee on Government Operations offers 13 recommendations on improving administrative practices. Although our committee has made no recommendations in this regard, I think it would be wise for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Institutes of Health to give earnest study and careful consideration to these recommendations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, President Kennedy proposed reorganizations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Trade Commission. The plans are numbered, respectively, 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Hearings on the plans are scheduled for Thursday, May 18, 1961, in room 1501-B, New House Office Building.

All parties interested should immediately contact the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, if they wish to express their views for or against the reorganization plans.

Unless the Senate or the House votes its disapproval within a 60-day period following submission of the plans by the

President, they will become the law of the land.

Plan Nos. 1 and 2, on the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission respectively, were submitted April 27. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on June 26.

Plan No. 3, affecting the Civil Aeronautics Board, was submitted on May 3. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on July 2.

Plan No. 4, affecting the Federal Trade Commission, was submitted on May 9. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on July 8.

Have always opposed a delegation of legislative power to the President as being unconstitutional. We have given the President our power to make the laws unless we interpose a veto.

On May 10, I introduced resolutions of disapproval for each of the four plans in order to provide an opportunity for opponents of the plans to express their views and for the House of Representatives to express its will.

These resolutions were referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The committee may be discharged from further consideration of the resolutions if they have not been reported prior to May 20.

A motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of any of these resolutions may be made by any member favoring the resolution of disapproval.

When the committee has reported or has been discharged, it shall at any time thereafter be in order to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Members opposed to a reorganization plan should vote "yes" on the resolution disapproving the plan.

While having introduced these resolutions of disapproval (H. Res. 285, 286, 287, 288) without regard to the merits of the individual plans, permit me to point out that each of the plans involves the delegation of important functions of the Commissioners to employees far removed from the control of the electorate.

It might also be noted that, despite the fact that the Committee on Government Operations, in reporting out the last extension of the basic enabling legislation—the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended—deplored "a tendency in recent years for the Executive to submit plans without the full justification in reducing expenditures and promoting economy that the bill requires," the President in each of the four plans submitted thus far, has simply stated:

It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have urged for some time that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare establish a Public Health Service shellfish laboratory in the North Shore area of Massachusetts, and I strongly recommend approval of this project for the East Coast in order to deal more effectively with the problems facing the industry and the serious depletion and

pollution which has taken place in past years.

The North Shore area of my district is famous for its clams all over the Nation and beyond, and officials of such municipalities as Newburyport, Ipswich and Essex strongly advised me that such a laboratory would serve a tremendously useful purpose in increasing clam populations to their former abundance and ridding shellfish of undesirable bacteria resulting from polluted waters. The North Shore area would be ideal from every standpoint as a site for experimental work on a laboratory scale.

The city of Gloucester, Mass., famous as a fish center, has also expressed a special interest in this project. The Fish and Wildlife Service already maintains a biological office there and important research work is being carried on.

The Public Health Service is well aware of the seriousness and the urgency associated with problems of the shellfish industry in Massachusetts and other States along the New England Coast and it is considering the New England area as a possible locale for such a laboratory. It believes that such a laboratory, if properly equipped, will assist in increasing the level of public-health protection afforded by the State shellfish sanitation programs. Your approval of this project is strongly urged.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I very cordially concur with the other Members of this distinguished body who have already complimented the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and every member of his so very important subcommittee—both majority and minority members—who have submitted this down-to-earth authorization bill for our consideration today. I use the term "down-to-earth bill" because almost every one of the items for which this splendid subcommittee has made study and recommended approval concerns millions of human beings who but for the furtherance of the programs in this bill might well be daily sufferers of death-dealing diseases and incurable maladies.

Each one of the past 14 years when the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island on the one hand, and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and their respective subcommittee members, have brought forth their recommendations I have noted with pleasure that wherever they recommended reductions, they clearly had good arguments to sustain same.

And, Mr. Chairman, wherever the bill recommended increases or new departures and adventures in human welfare, the bill sponsors always had what appeared to me as crystal clear, valid reasons for same. Not least of all in today's bill I note again the repeated emphasis on research in cancer and research in the illnesses affecting the aged citizens of our beloved Nation, especially together with the repeated emphasis upon child welfare and education of our youth.

I pass to the full subcommittee my sincere compliments on making such honorable compromises and adjustments

between themselves sufficient in sum and purpose so that they have brought this bill to the floor to our attention with their unanimous report and approval. Possibly my observation, which I now make on this point: to-wit, that the objectives of this bill are so high in purpose and necessity that this fact, together with other like basic factors, made it more than usually consistent and pleasant for all of the subcommittee members to join in unison in support of the bill as they have submitted it to us for approval. I thank them each and everyone for doing so.

UNANIMOUS REQUEST MADE IN DEBATE ON HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, this is my first year serving on this particular subcommittee of the full House Appropriations Committee, and I must say that it has been a real revelation to me. I want to heartily concur with the thoughts expressed by our chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the ranking Member on our side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] on the need for training, retraining, and vocational rehabilitation. I feel, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said, that in the chronically depressed areas around the country much more emphasis should have been placed on training rather than outright grants for the subsidizing of industry. I do not happen to regard automation as a curse, but rather regard it as another in a series of steps improving our way of life. It does call for more technical training on the part of our working force, and we are supplying additional funds in this bill to provide for a cooperative research program in the Office of Education to establish at least one demonstration project in the field of training, and of retraining persons displaced in their jobs in industry.

Now when we leave the discussion of the Department of Labor and move over into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we are in an area which directly and indirectly affects the lives of practically every living American from the cradle to the grave. In the Office of Education there has been a tremendous increase in personnel from 300 in 1952 to about 1,100 today, most of whom now seem engaged in activities far removed from what was intended in the original act setting up the Office. Many are engaged in promoting methods of education, recommending school curriculums, selling teaching machines, and sending agents throughout the Nation trying to sell school authorities on the idea that they need and should apply for Federal aid. Therefore, I am pleased that the committee has seen fit to reduce the budget request for salaries and expenses, and this reduction applies to the additional positions and related expenses requested.

I must say, however, that I am alarmed over the special report released from the Office of Education on April 25 from its Committee on Mission and Organization. This report proposes the complete reorganization of the Office of Education into a "Federal Education Agency for the Future." Coincidentally, S. 1726, intro-

duced on April 27, empowers the Commissioner of Education to make drastic changes in the structure and personnel of the Office which would implement the recommendation of his special committee for an entirely new structure of bureaus to be established under the new name of the "U.S. Education Agency." We would do well to watch this reshuffling of the Office of Education closely.

Turning to the field of health and welfare, may I say that it is not easy to sit across the table from eminent doctors and medical people who are making a plea for more and more funds in the field of cancer research, heart disease, mental health, blindness, cystic fibrosis, aid to crippled children's programs, and not react sympathetically. None of us are against doing what we can to wipe out these killers and disabilities; and members of the subcommittee find themselves on many occasions in a real tug of conscience, trying to strike a happy balance between what ought to be done and what we can afford to do with what resources are available.

There has been some concern expressed here this afternoon that the total amount of funds requested in the bill are some \$48 million over and above the budget request, but I would point out to the membership of this House that there are those on the committee who felt increases to the extent of \$200 million were in order. I point this out only to illustrate that on our subcommittee there have been some serious differences of opinion, and we spent portions of 3 days marking up the bill, which gives indication that considerable attention was given to each specific item in the bill. And while I would like to live within the budget request, I support this bill, knowing that there was a good measure of give and take by both sides.

The largest item in the bill is the \$2,285,800,000 in grants to the States for public assistance, and the unfortunate part about this whole business is that we can do nothing about cutting this amount unless we amend the present law; for the States are entitled to whatever they are willing to match in this regard. We can talk all we want to about local responsibility and States rights, but here is a program exceeding \$2¼ billion which should, in my judgment, be carried on by our States and local communities, and I shudder to think what the bill will be 10 years from now if it continues to increase as it has over the past 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and our ranking committee member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], have in the course of their remarks itemized all the facets of this appropriation bill, and it is not my intention to delay reading of the bill or rehashing points already made so well by those preceding me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, at a time of national peril involving our defense of the free world we are spending too much on health, education, welfare, and various social programs embraced in

this appropriation bill for the two departments for 1962.

Indeed, we are increasing our welfare expenditures in recent years two to one over our defense expenditures.

Such expenditures are all the more suspect when we realize this is a period of deficit financing, accompanied by all the dangers of inflation which weakens purchasing power and threatens the very stability of our currency. Our economy rests on the soundness of our money. The free world rests on the military strength of the United States. The U.S. military strength rests on our economy and the soundness of the dollar. Finally, our freedom to enjoy life in a free society rests on the outcome of our challenge of communism with the degradation and enslavement that accompanies it.

For my part, I am tired of the congressional business as usual which shows an increase in most items of expense over last year, although a reduction from what we might have spent. We get too interested in the double entry justification of our action and forget that what we really should be doing is cutting expenses below last year. Our national existence is in peril, yet we not only spend as usual but increase the welfare as though the cost were not so important.

We should get our priorities straight. First, and always, a balanced budget—even reduce debt and taxes—then military expense appropriation. After this there should be an apportionment of what remains to the necessary expenditures of Government.

To do less than to be fiscally responsible in this way is not my definition of a Congressman's role. This appropriation bill should and could be considerably less. Therefore, I oppose this bill.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, once again, as I have done so often in the past when this annual appropriation bill has come before us, I want to express my personal gratitude to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the magnificent work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation which is so vital to every American. As a result of the work of the Fogarty subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the American people have been living longer, living better, enjoying better health, better educational opportunities, improved health and welfare programs generally, and are enjoying greater protections against nearly all of the hazards of our fast-paced environment.

And, as usual, the report accompanying this annual appropriation bill constitutes once again one of the most interesting and useful documents to come before us from any committee of the House.

There is an important difference about this appropriation bill this year, however, which deserves comment, I believe. For the first time since I came to Congress 8 years ago, I am delighted to find that the executive department, from the President on down, has recognized without apology of any kind the vital importance of the funds requested for all

of the social welfare programs and consumer protection services covered in this bill, and this is truly a new atmosphere. I remember in 1953, when the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration, for instance, was slashed to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$5 million; in this bill we are appropriating the record level of \$23,580,000 for FDA.

NEED FOR FAR-REACHING CHANGES IN BASIC FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

A good part of the credit for the revitalization of the Food and Drug Administration in recent years must be ascribed to the effective report filed by the Citizens Advisory Committee in 1955 which spotlighted so dramatically the starvation appropriations this agency had been receiving. Before that, some of us had been vigorously, but unsuccessfully, trying to call these facts to the attention of the White House and the Budget Bureau during the first few years of the Eisenhower administration, but no one seemed to be listening.

I note that the committee report on this bill now suggests the establishment of a new Citizens Advisory Committee study to take up where the 1955 report left off, and to evaluate the work of the agency and its minimum needs on the basis of so many developments since 1955 in food, drug, and cosmetic technology.

To my mind, however, far more urgent than such a study—which I am sure would be worthwhile—is the need for a comprehensive rewriting of the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. In 23 years since that important act became law, we have had a series of patchwork improvements added on to it, but fundamentally the act suffers from many forms of obsolescence. That is why I prepared and introduced on the first day of this session H.R. 1235 which is an omnibus bill attempting to close the more glaring loopholes in the basic act.

GAPS IN PRESENT LAW WHICH WOULD BE CLOSED BY H.R. 1235

I am pleased to see that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff has recognized the importance of many of the changes proposed in my bill. In the hearings of the Fogarty subcommittee, furthermore, Commissioner Larrick of the FDA has gone through a list of shortcomings in the powers and authority of his agency, and these coincide to a great extent with the loopholes which H.R. 1235 would close. Briefly, some of them include:

First. The lack of authority to require pretesting for safety of all ingredients used in cosmetics, along the lines of the Food Additives Act of 1958 provisions for ingredients used in or on foodstuffs.

Second. The lack of an anticancer provision on cosmetics ingredients equivalent to the Delaney clause in the Food Additives Act and in the Color Additives Act of 1960.

Third. The lack of clear-cut authority for requiring easily readable labeling of foods, drugs and cosmetics, particularly as to weights and sizes.

Fourth. The lack of airtight factory inspection authority such as would be necessary to encourage more physicians

to prescribe medicines by generic terms rather than by trade names.

Fifth. The lack of effective regulatory powers over the sale and distribution of barbiturates and amphetamines, the so-called pep pills.

Sixth. The lack of required certification of all antibiotics rather than just the few covered in the basic act.

Seventh. The lack of authority to require proof of efficiency as well as of safety of new drugs.

Eighth. The lack of authority to require pretesting for safety and for efficacy of therapeutic devices.

TOO MANY LOOPHOLES FOR LEISURELY PIECEMEAL REPAIRS

Both Secretary Ribicoff and Commissioner Larrick have testified to the importance of such changes in the law. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been asked by Chairman OREN HARRIS of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report on H.R. 1235 as a prelude to scheduling hearings on this legislation, and I hope that the report when filed will constitute the overall endorsement of H.R. 1235 which I anticipate on the basis of the statements responsible officials of the Department have been making.

I have been told that it is not good legislative tactics to put so many controversial provisions into an omnibus bill which would touch so many unrelated industries, and thus might organize disparate pressure groups into a single, organized opposition to the whole bill. Yet I feel that in 23 years we have gone much too slowly in closing loopholes in the basic act as they have developed or have become glaring. The process of taking one subject at a time every 2 years or so, and closing the loopholes in just one area at a time, may serve to divide the opposition into manageable proportions, but the progress is much too slow. And, in the meantime, as technology changes, gaps in the law enable new dangers to the consumer to develop without control until enough damage has been done to the health or safety of enough people to warrant drastic action.

Therefore, I hope we can tackle the overall problem now with open minds and a determination to make the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act into the consumer protection statute it is supposed to be and which most Americans trustingly believe it to be.

OTHER IMPORTANT PROGRAMS IN APPROPRIATION BILL

In the meantime, I applaud the Fogarty subcommittee for its action in this bill not only on the Food and Drug Administration's record budget but on the tremendous amounts recommended for the National Institutes of Health and for other vital programs of the Public Health Service, including research into the major diseases which plague mankind and into the environmental factors which present such dangers to the public. These are among the most useful dollars spent each year by the Federal Government. There are so many other items of importance to the general public in this appropriation bill,

including programs of the Department of Labor, that it is impractical for me to try to mention them all in these few minutes.

But I do want to comment on the proposal in the committee report that the \$1 million-a-year program now in operation for assisting teachers to obtain training in the skills of teaching the mentally retarded be expanded to increase the limitation and also to include teachers of children with speech and hearing defects.

I was happy to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and other sponsors in the passage of the retarded children education assistance bill several years ago, but I feel that instead of continuing this limited approach we should go into the kind of broad overall program as called for in H.R. 15, which would establish a 7-year program of fellowships and scholarships for encouraging teachers in all fields of exceptional children, including the extraordinarily gifted.

When I introduced the original bill in the 85th Congress, it was my hope we could arrange for early hearings in that Congress on this whole subject of teachers of exceptional children, but no hearings were scheduled then or in the 86th Congress. I am pleased that the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is now planning to arrange such hearings for later in the current session, and I look forward to a comprehensive review of the needs in this field. An extensive research program was authorized in this area in the last Congress and I hope that we now have sufficient background information to justify going ahead with an effective action program to meet the needs of exceptional children.

ALL AREAS OF EXCEPTIONALITY SHOULD BE INCLUDED

Much as I recognize the need for more trained teachers for the mentally retarded, and for children with speech and hearing defects, as suggested by the Appropriations Subcommittee in its report, I think we must also open our eyes to the similar needs of children with other types of handicaps, including emotional disturbances, heart disease, the crippled, and so on. And with the increasing emphasis in our educational system in trying to locate and identify the extraordinarily gifted, we certainly need more teachers especially trained to give these outstanding youngsters the best possible guidance and help in achieving to their full learning potential. That holds true also for all of the exceptional children.

Mr. Chairman, again I congratulate the Fogarty subcommittee for an outstanding legislative accomplishment in this bill. While not every Member will be in agreement with every decision made in the legislation—obviously some compromises are required in connection with an appropriation bill aggregating, as this one does, more than four and a quarter billions of dollars—the net re-

sult is a magnificent recognition of the social welfare needs of our country.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1962 appropriation bill for the Office of Education contemplates several serious reductions below the budget request—reductions which will hamper the new Commissioner of Education in his effort to assist American education achieve the level of excellence which the Nation deserves and needs.

The first reduction involves a cut of \$1 million in the program of graduate fellowships—the program of the National Defense Education Act which was designed to improve the quality and quantity of our college and university teachers.

The second cut involves a reduction of \$350,000 in the request for institutes for guidance and counseling personnel. This program of the National Defense Education Act was enacted in order to improve the quality of guidance given to our high school students so that we would have fewer dropouts and more capable students would go on to higher education.

The third serious reduction is in the appropriation for salaries and expenses. The reduction of \$500,000 would mean the elimination of about 40 positions—a serious handicap to a new Commissioner of Education. The positions eliminated would retard the improvement of educational statistics; would eliminate the College Information Center, a service program for high school students and their parents to assist in the selection of a proper course of higher education; and would seriously hamper meeting the workload increases under the National Defense Education Act, particularly in the area of audit of loan, grant, and contract programs with universities and colleges.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1580-1605), \$210,857,000, of which \$75,145,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions to student loan funds, of which not to exceed \$1,300,000 shall be for such loans for non-Federal capital contributions; \$54,000,000 shall be for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for science, mathematics, or modern foreign language equipment and minor remodeling of facilities; \$3,750,000 shall be for grants to States for supervisory and other services; \$12,800,000 shall be for grants to States for area vocational education programs; and \$15,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of science, mathematics, and modern language teaching equipment, or equipment suitable for use for teaching in such fields of education, which can be identified as originating in or having been exported from a Communist country, unless such equipment is unavailable from any other source.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 18, line 10, strike out the period and insert:

"Provided further, That no part of the appropriations contained in this paragraph shall be available for fellowships in the humanities and social sciences field."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to try to get the National Defense Education Act back to where I am sure the Congress intended it should be; that is, to provide fellowships for the study of mathematics, physics, engineering, chemistry, and other similar sciences as an aid to the national defense effort of this country. This thing has gone far astray. We now provide fellowships for social studies, studies in humanities, and so forth. My amendment simply brings it back to where I think it should be. I know of no reason why under the National Defense Education Act there should be studies of the ecology and economics of flowing water, English folklore, and American folklore. What is the difference between English and American folklore? I will be pleased to have any member of the committee tell me the difference and why we should be providing fellowships under the National Defense Act to study folklore, jazz, the theater, and so forth.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman on folklore and jazz, but we can do a great deal of good in the economics of flowing water field, if I understood the term which the gentleman used correctly. The water supply of our country and of the allied countries of the world is a vital asset in the cold war, and a good water supply is necessary.

Mr. GROSS. If this is so imperative why did you not write something into the water pollution bill to provide for education on this subject?

Mr. EDMONDSON. In this instance you have to begin in the schools. You have to prepare your men and women.

Mr. GROSS. These are fellowships. This does not deal with kindergarten or elementary schools.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I am certainly in sympathy with what the gentleman intends to do. But at our service academies, whether it be the Army, Navy, or Air Force, in the curriculum are also studies in the humanities and social sciences. Would the gentleman wipe out those courses of study at our defense academies?

Mr. GROSS. Those are special and particular schools. Cadets do not major, as the gentleman well knows, in such subjects as folklore, the theater, anthropology, and ballet dancing.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. By the wording of the gentleman's amendment it covers a rather wide scope.

Mr. GROSS. It just brings it back to mathematics, physics, engineering, and chemistry where I think it ought to be and where I think most Members of Congress thought it ought to be when

they voted for the National Defense Education Act. If the Members of the House will turn to page 467 of the hearings, they will find page after page of grants to various universities and colleges for studies in humanities and social subjects; but when you get to mathematics, physics, and so forth, the number drops very materially.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman would not object seriously to a study of political science that was concentrated upon some of the political problems that are vital to our defense; would he? He would not contend that would be entirely unrelated to our defense effort; would he?

Mr. GROSS. Not entirely unrelated, but political science is being taught in every university without the necessity for fellowships that are financed with millions of dollars in Federal funds.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is very obvious that the demand for these fellowships indicates there is a great deal of interest in the field. It is a field that our educational leaders think relates to defense.

Mr. GROSS. There will always be a demand for something that is free.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I seem to recall, Mr. Chairman, that when the National Defense Education Act was up the statement was made there was not one word in it that had to do with defense. That is why I voted against it. I agree with the gentleman, I do not think this is any part of defense, and I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his pertinent observation, and urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to close the debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has offered an amendment to an appropriation bill which, in effect, is an amendment to existing law. He is offering such an amendment today in the form of a limitation on funds for this part of the National Defense Education Act. When the Congress is considering extension of the National Defense Edu-

cation Act is the time this should be straightened out, if it needs straightening out. But the act did not confine itself strictly to mathematics, foreign languages and science. It went far beyond that. I do not see why we should today take over the responsibilities of the proper legislative committee to amend the National Defense Education Act by approving the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 11: Loans and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, loans and payments under title II of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made, thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid for the same purposes during the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment on some information that has been supplied to me by Members of the House with regard to the allocation of the funds for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education. The information which has been supplied to me on how the Office plans to allocate the cut in their request is not in accordance with the committee report. We would certainly request that the new Commissioner of Education follow this report, and give consideration to the desires of the committee as expressed in the hearings.

It is my understanding that the Office of Education plans to reduce, by just a little over one-third, the number of new positions requested. The committee's report expressly states that the reduction is over 50 percent. During the hearings on this portion of the Office's budget, the weaknesses in the area of statistics was commented on at length and emphasized not only by committee members but by the witnesses. I have been told that the Office of Education plans to apply a major part of the cut to their budgeted program to improve statistics in the field of education. I hope that the information I have received is not correct but, if it is, I certainly think some reprogramming is in order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for

the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks and include extraneous matter, and that I may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.